DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 473 TM 004 319

AUTHOR	Griffith, Lynda W.; And Others
TITLE	Evaluation of Early Childhood Education: A Model Cities-Supported Preschool Program.
INSTITUTION	Institute for Community Studies, Kansas City, Mo.
SPONS AGENCY	Kansas City Model Cities Dept., Mo.
REPORT NO	71-197
PUB DATE	Sep 71
NOTE	276p.; Not Available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Child Development; Childhood Needs; Disadvantaged Youth; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Objectives; Educational Programs; *Evaluation Methods; Handicapped Children; Individual Differences; *Inner City; Kindergarten Children; Parent Participation; Program Administration; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Staff Role; Teaching Methods; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Head Start; Kansas City; Model Cities; Montessori Method

ABSTRACT

A Head Start Program operating in Kansas City since 1965 was viewed as inadequate because enrollment was limited to about 600 children per year. The Model Cities Agency determined to provide a program for the remainder of the children in the Model Cities neighborhoods. The programs developed were differentiated administratively for the purposes of this evaluation and the program considered a single entity and referred to as Early Childhood Education. These questions were developed as evaluation goals: What specific educational approaches were provided?; To what degree do the children grow to the stated objectives?; Do these programs meet the emotional, social, physical, and intellectual needs of the program's four-year-old children?; Do these children grow differentially?; Are specified goals reached as anticipated by staff?; What program differences account for student growth differences?; Do parents in the parent education component change relevant to their children's development?; Are these programs complementary with kindergarten programs of urban schools?; What are the effects of staff development activities?; Is program administration effective?; Are children with special problems provided assistance in achievement of program objectives?; And what program changes should be made? Each question is treated in succession and is detailed. Summaries giving the main thrust are provided after each section. (RC)

ED103473

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM PS
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

EVALUATION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

A MODEL CITIES-SUPPORTED FRESCHOOL PROGRAM

Lynda W. Griffith
Franklin W. Neff
Winton M. Ahlstrom

TM 004 319 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This research was conducted under contract #1203-2 with the Model Cities Department of Kansas City, Missouri. The report expresses the views of the authors and does not represent the views or policies of the Model Cities Department.

Institute for Community Studies
Kansas City, Missouri

Publication Number 71-197
September, 1971

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction		1
Question		
1	What specific educational approaches were provided for children in the Early Childhood Education Program sponsored by Model Cities?	4
2	To what degree do children who participate in Model Cities-sponsored Early Childhood Education Programs grow toward stated objectives?	51
3	Do these programs meet the emotional, social, physical, and intellectual needs of four-year-old children living in the Model Cities neighborhoods?	63
4	Does student growth toward the specified objectives occur as anticipated by the program staff?	64
5	Do children who participate in different Early Childhood Education Programs grow differentially?	72
6	What differences among programs may account for differences in student growth?	79
7	Do parents who participate in the parent educational component change their behavior and attitude relevant to their children's development?	80
8	Are these programs complementary with the kindergarten programs of the urban Kansas City schools?	89
9	What are the effects of the staff development activities?	96
10	Is program administration effective?	106
11	Are children with special problems which affect their educational development provided the assistance they need in order to make progress toward eventual achievement in the area of program objectives?	132
12	What changes in program should be made?	135
Appendices		138

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1-1	Structural and Organizational Features of the Basic ECE Program as Indicated in Percentage Distribution of PROSE Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observation Periods	16
1-2	Children's Responses and Experiences in the ECE Basic Program as Indicated in Percentage Distributions of PROSE Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observations	17
1-3	Rank Order of the Percentage Distribution of the PROSE Instructional Categories for the November, 1970, and April, 1971, PROSE Observations for the Basic Program	18
1-4	Structural and Organizational Features of the Montessori ECE Program as Indicated in Percentage Distribution of PROSE Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observational Periods	24
1-5	Children's Responses and Experiences in the Montessori Program as Indicated in Percentage Distributions of PROSE Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observations	26
1-6	Rank Order of the Percentage Distributions of the PROSE Instructional Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observations	28
1-7	Comparison of Montessori and Basic Classes on PROSE Categories for Two Observation Periods	31
1-8	Average Percent of PROSE Codings by Category for Eight Basic Classrooms and Range Across Classrooms for Observation 3	34
1-9	Head Start/Model Cities Early Childhood Education Classroom Orientation PROSE Description — April, 1971	41
1-10	Average Class Membership Early Childhood Education/Head Start, May, 1971	49
2-1	October and May Mean Scores and Mean Gain Scores on Ten Measures and Predicted May Scores on Six Measures	61
2-2	T^2 and F Ratios for Four Tests of Student Growth	62
4-1	Student Attainment in Objective Areas — Basic Program Teacher Assessment on Interim Checklists — Sample Classes Only	70

Table		Page
4-2	Student Attainment in Objective Areas — Montessori Program Teacher Assessment on Interim Checklists — Sample Classes Only	70
4-3	Reliability of Interim Checklist Data Correlation Between Checklist Ranking	71
4-4	Correlation Between Caldwell Scores and Checklist Data	71
5-1	Average Difference and Gain Scores on Ten Measures	74
5-2	Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Scores on Six Measures	76
7-1	Responses of Parents in Parent Interview Questionnaire at Beginning of the 1970-71 ECE Program	82
7-2	Correlations Between Parent Participation and Gain Scores on Ten Measures for 61 Students	84
7-3	Correlations Between Attendance Data and Gain Scores on Ten Measures for 104 Students	85
7-4	Sample Classroom Teacher's Perception of Parent Participation in Their Child's School Experience	86
7-5	Parent Responses to Questionnaire Concerning Parent Involvement Component and the ECE Program	87
10-1	What is the main purpose of a pre-school program?	109
10-2	How clear have you been about what the program leaders expected you to attain with the children?	109
10-3	How appropriate have the expectations of the program leaders been, given the situation in which you had to work?	110
10-4	Have you had the information you need (about the children, program supplies, program activities, schedules, available staff assistance, etc.) to do your job well?	110
10-5	Assessment of Role Performance	112
10-6	Assessment of Role Responsibility	113
10-7	How clearly have your duties and responsibilities been defined this year?	114
10-8	Assessment of Ancillary Services	115

Table		Page
10-9	Assessment of Materials, Supplies, and Equipment Quality . . .	118
10-10	Assessment of Materials, Supplies, and Equipment Quantity . .	119
10-11	Assessment of Materials, Supplies, and Equipment Acquisition .	120
10-12	Assessment of Facilities	122
10-13	Assessment of Preparation and Training	124
10-14	Assessment of Contributors to Success	125
10-15	Have you had the information you need (about children, program supplies, program activities, schedules, available staff assistance, etc.) to do your job well?	126
10-16	Ranking of Influence — This Year and Next Year	128
10-17	Questions from Section VII — Rewards for work accomplished. .	130
10-18	From what you observed, how well organized and administered has the pre-school program been this year?	131

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their appreciation to those individuals and institutions which have made this evaluation effort possible. It is impossible to name everyone in this short space but we want, particularly, to thank all those involved with the ECE Program, the directors, the instructional leaders, the teachers, and all the wonderful children. We are grateful for the continuous cooperation of the Model Cities evaluation staff and the Division of Urban Education evaluation staff.

We want to thank the data collectors, those who administered the pre post tests and our tireless classroom observers.

In addition, we want to thank the fine consultants who assisted us throughout the year: Jean Orost of ETS; Larry Havlicek and Joseph Weaver of the University of Kansas; Joe Joyce, Arlene Payne, and Robert Stephenson, of the University of Missouri — Kansas City. We also want to acknowledge the services of the UMKC Computer.

Finally, we want to thank the secretaries, Norma Damon and Carole Wise, who have been of invaluable assistance from the typing of the first draft of the contract to the last word of the final report.

To all of you, and those I've been unable to include, we say thank you.

Introduction

Program Origins

Among the educational efforts of the Kansas City, Missouri, Model Cities Agency, early childhood education was given a high priority. Evidence accumulated in the last 5-10 years indicates that unless the children from inner-city areas are provided with preschool experiences prior to their entry into kindergarten they are not able to advance in school at a normal rate.

Although a Head Start program has been operated in Kansas City, Missouri, since 1965, it was not viewed as adequate for the needs of the city. Only children from low-income families were eligible for Head Start and the total enrollment was limited to about 600 children per year. The Model Cities Agency determined to provide a program for the remainder of the children in the Model Cities neighborhoods.

To develop such a program, negotiations began between the School District (which administered the educational component of the Head Start program) and the Model Cities Agency. A contract for the Early Childhood Education Program was drawn in the spring of 1970. It provided the additional support needed for a program operated by the School District which would combine the ECE and the Head Start efforts in the Model Cities neighborhoods so that all resident children were eligible for participation.

Therefore, although it was necessary to differentiate the programs administratively, for the purposes of this evaluation, the program is considered as a single entity and will be referred to as Early Childhood Education (ECE). Classes selected (as discussed later in this document) for the evaluation procedures included some supported by the Human Resources Corporation (Head Start) as well as some supported by MCA.

Staff were recruited and some training provided by the end of June, 1970. A relatively short summer program was initiated for some children in the Model Cities neighborhoods. The main program started the latter part of September, 1970, and continued until May or June, 1971. Information on sites and facilities is provided elsewhere in this document.

Evaluation Overview

The Model Cities Evaluation Staff had decided to invest considerable effort in the evaluation of this program. Although the local Head Start project had been included in national evaluations, little quantitative data were available on the impact of the local program on the children involved.

Arrangements were made with the Institute for Community Studies to design an evaluation appropriate to the intent and scope of the ECE Program. This design was developed in collaboration with ECE Program staff and Model Cities staff during the summer of 1970. The following questions were developed as the goals for the evaluation effort:

1. What specific educational approaches were provided for children in the Early Childhood Education programs sponsored by Model Cities?
2. To what degree do children who participate in Model Cities-sponsored Early Childhood Education Programs grow towards stated objectives?
3. Do these programs meet the emotional, social, physical, and intellectual needs of four-year-old children living in the Model Cities neighborhoods?
4. Does student growth toward the specified objectives occur as anticipated by the program staff?
5. Do children who participate in different ECE programs grow differentially?
6. What difference among programs may account for differences in student growth?
7. Do parents who participate in the parent education component change their behavior and attitudes relevant to their children's development?

8. Are these programs complementary with kindergarten programs of urban Kansas City schools?

9. What are the effects of staff development activities?

10. Is program administrative effective?

11. Are children with special problems which affect their educational development provided the assistance they need in order to make progress toward eventual achievement in the area of program objectives?

12. What changes in program should be made?

The remainder of this document is organized around those questions, treating each in succession.

Since this is the basic report, it is rather detailed. For those readers who prefer to get the main thrust only, summaries have been provided at the end of each section. By reading those, one can get the main ideas of the report.

Question 1

What Specific Educational Approaches were Provided for Children in the Early Childhood Education Program sponsored by Model Cities?

a. What Were the Stated Objectives of Different Programs, Basic and Montessori?

Two basic approaches were provided in the ten sample classes. Eight followed the ECE curriculum and two followed a Montessori curriculum as defined by the Abaca Montessori School at Avila College. None of the small classes for children with special learning problems were included in the sample group.

Before classes began in the fall, the overall objectives for each program were obtained (see Appendices A and B). During the year, interim objectives were obtained at eight week intervals. These were the specific behavioral objectives formulated to explicate the overall objectives. These objectives were organized in checklist form for each teacher to use in assessing the progress of individual children. The eight ECE teachers completed three checklists, one each after 8 weeks, 16 weeks, and 24 weeks (see Appendix C). The Montessori teacher completed two, a combination 8- and 16-week checklist and a 24-week checklist (see Appendix D).

An initial review of the overall objectives of the two approaches reveals great differences in organization and terminology. This is illustrated by the objective areas.

Basic Program Objective Areas

1. Cognitive Development
   - a. Language
   - b. Abstract Concepts
   - c. Synthesizing Behavior
2. Affective Development
   Self Concept
3. Psychomotor Development
   Manipulation Skills

Montessori Program Objective Areas

1. Motor Activities

2. Sensory Experiences

3. Exercises for Language Development

4. Exercises in Sensory Geometry and Number

The specific objectives in each area and the interim objectives do not substantiate the apparent dissimilarity in objectives. The Montessori program cited 23 overall objectives. There was a parallel objective for 17 of these in the Basic program list of overall objectives and three more appeared in parallel form on the basic program interim objective checklist. Only three overall Montessori objectives were not parallel to an objective of the Basic program.

The three objectives from the Montessori program for which there did not appear to be a parallel objective in the Basic program were:

1. To promote care of self and of environment.

2. To facilitate spontaneous exploration of the outer environment, both natural and manmade.

3. To increase knowledge of more specific vocabulary in order to open out the Cosmic world.

The Basic program contained 26 overall objectives. There was a parallel overall objective on the Montessori list for 21 of these. Three were parallel on a Montessori interim objective checklist and two were dissimilar.

The two ECE objectives which were not matched in the Montessori set were:

1. To recognize and reproduce visual symbols, i.e., signs, letters, etc.

2. To have success as a learner.

In addition to providing the statement of overall or interim objectives, these document (Appendices A, B, C, and D) also specify, to a degree, the educational approach which is to be utilized in developing the objectives. These are the intended

learning activities which are stipulated by the nature of the objectives. For example, attainment of the objectives which deal with the development of eye-hand coordination is promoted through practical life activities in the Montessori classes — pouring, threading needles, etc. Whereas, more traditional arts and crafts activities, coloring, cutting, pasting, are the vehicles for the development of this objective in the ECE classes.

There are also differences in emphasis which are not immediately apparent in the overall objectives. The Montessori program aims at the development of self direction in learning through individual interaction with materials and the social environment. The materials and time schedules are organized to provide children the opportunity to explore and develop on his own or in a one-to-one relationship with an adult.

In the ECE Program, a heavier emphasis is placed on the development of skills through interaction with other children. There is greater provision in the directed activities for large- and small-group learning.

There are also differences in the materials used. The Montessori program utilizes carefully developed equipment having a specifically designated purpose. Pitchers and glasses are to develop practical life abilities — not for playing house. The pink pyramid is to develop stacking and size relationship ability and not to be used as a make-believe train or other non-designated purpose. In the ECE Program, a more traditional approach toward free play and fantisizing activities is followed. Materials are to be used as the creative talents and interests of the teachers or children dictate, rather than in a carefully prescribed manner.

It should be noted here that this analysis refers to stated objectives. Within both the Basic program and the Montessori program, teachers varied their activities and emphases. It would be misleading to consider all classes in the Basic program as having the same goals and engaging in the same activities. For this reason, the classes studied were

considered — for most purposes — as separate programs, each having unique experiences and diverse goals.

In summary, the stated objectives of the Basic and Montessori programs were essentially similar. It seems likely that differences in formal statements do reflect differences in educational approach and emphasis, but that intended outcomes are not drastically different. There may be greater emphasis in the Basic program on specific preparation for reading.

b. What Intended Learning Activities Took Place in the Early Childhood Education Program?

In the preceding section which dealt with the statements of objectives for both Montessori and ECE programs, some discussion was presented of the kinds of curricular activities and experiences program planners viewed as important for the attainment of program goals. Although the terminology differed somewhat, the goal statements for the Basic program were similar in many respects to those for Montessori. There were differences in emphasis on the importance of certain objectives relative to the others, and each of the programs specified certain objectives that appeared to be relatively unique to them.

The major program differences appeared in the statement and plans from program staff concerning intended program activities and learning experience and methods for implementing their curriculum.

The Basic program approach to Early Childhood Education derives from experiences in the Head Start program which had been developed during the past three years. The curriculum guide for teachers was developed by the Department of Urban Education under the direction of the Director of Education of the Head Start Program. It includes descriptions of learning activities designed to obtain specific

objectives. It does not emphasize a specific kind of organization and structure of the classroom.

The Basic program curriculum and instructional guide presents an eccletic approach to providing activities and experiences that will facilitate learning in the areas of the objectives of the program. Learning activities are intended to facilitate development in language, self concept, psychomotor, and affective areas.

In terms of program objectives initially specified by ECE staff, the intended 1970-71 program was to include a relatively heavy focus on instructional activities on sensory discrimination (visual and auditory) as well as on language development. Psychomotor skills, particularly those involving fine motor behaviors were to be emphasized in various learning activities. Social skills and peer group relationships were to be continuously nurtured through group and peer interactions. The child's self image was to be enhanced through activities intended to help him gain an awareness of himself as an individual, (learning his name — his body parts) and of his surroundings and through recognizing his accomplishments. Initiative and curiosity were to be encouraged in the classroom as was his expression of feelings through music/rhythm, dancing, marching and "free play" periods.

Learning activities were to be sequential to some extent. All of these activities in areas of program objectives were to be implemented during the year but certain components or levels of these were to be emphasized at different times. Initially, simple language and sensory discrimination learning was to be the focus. Numerical and scientific concepts were to be introduced gradually as the child's communication skills (listening-comprehending-questioning) developed.

On the basis of the goals of the Montessori Method and the curriculum activities and materials unique to the approach and described in discussions with the Program

Director, the instructional emphasis was to be in motor, sensory, language, and arithmetic areas. Classroom space was to be organized and structured into four major areas: (1) practical life, (2) sensorial, (3) language, and (4) mathematics. Learning activities were to be centered around these four areas, each of which was to be a learning environment with specific activities related to specified objectives. Special instructional devices were to be a part of each of these environments with the children being taught to use these devices in a certain way, specific to a particular learning task and stage of learning. Each activity was to be graduated in terms of difficulty or developmental level.

The instructional method and role of the adults in the Montessori classroom were to be oriented toward providing children opportunity to learn in an atmosphere where self discipline, individual initiative, and self reliance could be fostered. Learning experience was to focus, also, on the child learning to work cooperatively with others in social and group goal oriented activities. However, major emphasis of the program was to provide opportunity and appropriate materials for the child to work relatively independently. Task completion was to be stressed. Individualized instruction was to be an important part of the teacher's activities, but directed mainly toward the end of assisting the child toward greater independence. The teacher's role was seen as encouraging the child to do things for himself and to provide supervision and guidance toward this end.

The Measurement Tool — PROSE. In attempting to determine what intended learning activities actually took place during the program, the ten sample classrooms were observed at three different points in time during the preschool year: the first in November, 1970, the second in January and the third in April, 1971. The measure employed in the observation was the Personal Record of School Experience (PROSE). This measure was

developed by Medley and his staff at Educational Testing Service (ETS) and was the result of about 15 years experience in the development and use of observational techniques.

The decision to use this approach for describing the program was reached after an extensive review of observational literature, particularly in early childhood education, and after consultation with national figures in the field of early childhood eduction. The PROSE was one of the few observational tools specifically designed for observing preschool classrooms. A brief description of this method of observation and the categories comprising it is provided here so as to make more meaningful and descriptive statements concerning the program in the pages to follow.

The PROSE is an individual - oriented, time sampling observational procedure. The observer in the classroom codes the immediate behavior and experiences (called an event) of each target child every 25 seconds for a series of five events (called a cycle). He does this by selecting from a list of alternative "words" on the PROSE record sheet, the ones that appear most appropriate for describing a specific event.

Recording a cycle of 5 events requires approximately 100 seconds of observation time. Immediately after completion of a cycle, the observer describes the context of the classroom as he observed it during the just-completed cycle of five events. He records this on the reverse side of the PROSE protocol where eight different areas of context description are listed (see Appendix E). Within each area are lists of code words from which the observer selects those most appropriate for describing the context observed during the cycle of events just recorded. This recording requires approximately five minutes.

The descriptive categories coded with the PROSE that deal with the child's experience in the classroom are as follows:

1. Amount of time the child is in contact with adults, who the adult is (teacher, aide, other), the nature of the child's contact with adult, the response of the adult to the child.

2. Amount and kind of peer interaction in the classroom.

3. Vehicle through which contacts with others in classroom are expressed (i.e., physical contact, exchange of materials, verbal).

4. Amount of time child is working or playing alone.

5. The extent to which a child is "doing what he is supposed to be doing" and the ways he experiences and uses classroom materials.

6. The affective tone of the child's experience in the classroom.

7. The physical activity level and extent of locomotion among children in the classroom.

The PROSE categories which provide descriptions of the context within which classroom experiences of children occur is as follows:

1. Instructional areas and the kind of learning materials used.

2. The role of the adult in the classroom.

3. The atmosphere of the room identified in such categories as excited, tense, quiet, busy, idle.

4. Classroom organization and structure including group size and location of classroom activity.

In addition to these context items, the PROSE also provided for the identification of pupil and teacher responses that do not occur as frequently and, thus might not be identified in the 25-second time sampling observation of individual children. Categories of specific behaviors of the observed child comprise 27 items, including such behaviors as "sang and talked to self," "helped peer," "showed affection for peer," "cried," "lost temper," "tattled," "showed fear," "refused help," "disobeyed," "showed hostility to an adult."

Categories of adult behaviors, experienced directly by a child or observed by the child in the classroom setting, include "ridiculed by an adult," "used as bad example," "used as good example," "teacher called for quiet," "adult threatened," "lost temper," "teacher laughed with children," "adult used physical restraint."

In substance, the method provides a series of shorthand descriptive statements of specific events in the life of a child in the classroom. The reliability of codings by observers vary markedly over the various behavior categories, depending upon experience of the observers with the instrument as well as by the specificity with which definitions of behaviors in PROSE categories can be defined.

Each target child (those in the sample) is observed in an ordered sequence predetermined by random assignment. Following completion of coding one cycle and its context for the first child, the observer repeats this procedure for the next child and so on until each child in sequence has had one cycle and context coded on his own individual PROSE protocol. The observer then repeats this process, beginning with the first child until all children again have been observed once cycle. On a subsequent day, the observer repeats this process.

Part of the training of PROSE observers included a two-day workshop in November, 1970, conducted by Jean Orost of the Educational Testing Service (ETS), a co-worker of Medley. She had been involved in refining the procedure and had recently conducted training sessions for PROSE observers for ETS evaluation projects.

The PROSE manual used in the workshop and during in-service training that followed provided definitions and examples of specific, concrete behaviors to be coded in the PROSE categories. Video tapes of pre-school classrooms were used in training, for practicing, discussing and comparing codings, and for clarifying definitions of behaviors to be coded. Reliability studies were done for each of the three PROSE observation periods. Each observer was paired with each of the other observers and each pair simultaneously coded the behavior of a specific child (a total of seven children for each pair) in classrooms selected for study.

These results are presented in the Appendix F.

In-service training or refresher sessions were held just prior to and following each of the three observations with the PROSE. Although out of these sessions did come some redefinition of certain categories and the inclusion of certain kinds of behaviors in others, no basic changes were made in the coding categories or the method of data collection. Modifications which were made are noted in the text and their significance is discussed.

In order to assure as representative a description as possible of children's ECE learning experience during a preschool day (half day), PROSE observations were scheduled to begin when the children were getting off the bus and to continue through their lunch period and their departure for home. This extension of the ECE learning environment to be observed came out of discussions with ECE program staff who expressed the view that instructional activities take place during these times as well as in the classroom.

Four individuals, three of whom had participated in pretesting ECE children, were employed and trained as PROSE observers. Two observers visited each of the ten sample classrooms on two different days and at different scheduled times to assure that all periods of a pre-school day were covered in their observations. On each visit, the observer coded one cycle of behavior (5 events) and the classroom context within which each cycle of events occurred. When each of the observation periods ended, each classroom had been visited four times by two different individuals and each child had been observed and his behavior and context coded for four cycles. (This was modified for the third observation with an increased number of observations made.) During each of the three PROSE data collection periods, each target child was observed for a total of 10 to 15 minutes. Thus, a sample classroom with 15 children was observed 3 to 4 hours;

for the total ten classrooms in each of the three observational periods, about 30 to 40 hours of actual observation time was recorded out of the approximately 50 to 65 hours observers were in the ECE classrooms. The total number of observations, i.e., specific events for which PROSE observers coded classroom experiences of children were for the first, second and third observation periods respectively, 2,760, 2,560 and 3,530.

Data regarding reliability checks are in Appendix F.

PROSE Description of the Basic and Montessori Programs. The evaluation contract stipulates that the Basic and Montessori programs be evaluated to determine similarities and differences. Therefore, the 8 Basic classrooms combined and the two Montessori classrooms are assessed and described separately using PROSE observational data collected in November, 1970 (the first observation) and April, 1971 (the third and final observation of classrooms). These two observational periods were selected because they provide early and late descriptions of the program.

The third, particularly, should be a stable and reliable reflection of the classroom. Data from the second PROSE Observation (collected about mid-point in the program) provides some information about developing trends in the program but rather systematic and marked increases or decreases in percentages of PROSE categories relative to the first and third observational data occurred across classrooms. This suggests that there were factors distorting program description at the time of this observation. Although there were some changes in the data collection procedures from the first to the third observation period (including periods of the classroom day to be observed and some refining and extension of PROSE category definitions to be coded), no similar systematic, marked increase or decrease in percentage distributions across classrooms and programs occurred.

In the section following this one, consideration is given to differences in PROSE data within the Basic program, i.e., differences between classrooms.

The Basic Program in November, 1970 — PROSE data from the first and third observation of the Basic program are summarized in Tables 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3. The next several paragraphs will discuss the November observation. Following that, the April data will be discussed.

The percentages reported in these tables which are the basis for describing programs are based on a total of 2,260 events observed in the 8 Basic classrooms in the November, 1970, data collection and 2,690 events observed in the April, 1971, period. Our treatment of these data did not include statistical tests.

Given the large number of codings it is likely that many of the differences among percentages would be statistically significant. However, reliability considerations and data processing complexities resulted in a decision to omit statistical tests. The analysis will consider differences on the basis of judgmental examination of the magnitude of the range of percentages and the average around which they vary.

It is necessary to examine percents within a given category, since each category represents a separate coding. Not all subcategories are provided for every category, thus do not total 100 percent. Since some PROSE categories are coded only one-fifth as often as some others, the number of codings upon which percentages are based varies. In every case in these tables, the number is in excess of 450 separate codings.

Data for November, 1970 from the eight Basic classrooms combined indicate that the interpersonal experiences of children in ECE classrooms revolved primarily around various kinds of contacts and interactions with adults (53% of the time observed) that this was usually the teacher (38% of observations, or about 72% of contacts with adults). The other adults in the classroom, usually teacher aides, were observed in some kind of contact with the children 14 percent of the time. These child-adult contacts occurred mainly in group participation activities led by adults. The most frequent teacher activities with children was instructional, i.e., showing, telling or

Table 1-1

Structural and Organizational Features of the Basic ECE Program as Indicated in Percentage Distribution of PROSE Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observation Periods

PROSE Categories	Percent of Observations	
	Observation 1	Observation 3
Child interacts or has contact[a,b]		
with an adult	53%	52%
with another child	15	11
with no one (observed alone)	30	37
With an adult[a,b]		
as participant in adult led group	38	40
as star (center of adult's attention)	10	9
by initiating contact	2	1
Adults with whom child interacts[a,b]		
Teacher	34	34
Teacher aides	14	9
Other	4	8
Adult's classroom behavior toward child[a,b]		
Teacher permits choices	2	9
Demonstrates and informs	24	19
Listens to and questions children	9	10
Does things for child	8	6
Controls/manages children's behavior	8	6
Other	1	2
Grouping of adults and children in classroom[c,d]		
One child with adult	3	2
Two children with adult	3	4
Three to five with adult	15	11
Six or more with adult	16	8
All children with adult	42	51
Children in groups without adult[c,d]		
One child	1	1
Two	5	5
Three to five	4	5
Six or more	1	2
All children	-	-

[a]Number of codings, Observation 1, was 2,260.

[b]Number of codings, Observation 3, was 2,690.

[c]Number of codings, Observation 1, was 452.

[d]Number of codings, Observation 3, was 538.

Table 1-2

Children's Responses and Experiences in the ECE Basic Program as Indicated in Percentage Distributions of PROSE Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observations

PROSE Categories	Percent of Observations	
	Observation 1	Observation 3
Child's response to adult and classroom setting[a,b]		
Is cooperative	87%	86%
Is distracted	4	6
Responding to own needs (day dreaming)	2	3
Is disruptive to class	2	1
Child's individual use of material in classroom[a,b]		
Is in fantasy	5	4
Is different or divergent	6	7
Is conventional or convergent	17	10
Is in work-cleanup	2	3
Child's activity level is[a,b]		
High to moderate including running or walking	14	19
Moderate with no locomotion	22	60
Low, sitting or standing with very little movement	41	18
Classroom climate--children are[c,d]		
Attentive and excited	2	3
Noisy and excited	8	9
Noisy and busy	27	39
Quiet and busy	45	35
Quiet and idle	5	9
Child interacts with peers[a,b]	15	11
by initiating contact	4	2
in an aggressive way	1	1
in a cooperative way	10	8
by resisting or withdrawing	1	0
Child's contacts with others[a,b]		
Physical contact (touching-holding)	9	5
Exchange or use of materials	20	28
Verbal communications	38	30
Children's experiences in classroom[a,b]		
are strongly positive	3	12
are strongly negative	0	1

[a] Number of codings, Observation 1, was 2,260.

[b] Number of codings, Observation 3, was 2,690

[c] Number of codings, Observation 1, was 452.

[d] Number of codings, Observation 3, was 538.

Table 1-3

Rank Order of the Percentage Distribution of the PROSE Instructional Categories for the November, 1970, and 1971, PROSE Observations for the Basic Program

PROSE Instructional Activity Categories	November 1970 1st PROSE Observation[a]		April 1971 3rd PROSE Observation[b]	
	%	Rank	%	Rank
Free Play	19%	13.0	13%	11.0
Rest/Eating	16	12.0	7	7.5
Routine/Transition	15	11.0	13	11.0
Language	12	10.0	19	12.0
Arts and Crafts	8	9.0	10	9.0
Social Skills	6	8.0	3	4.0
Sensory	5	7.0	13	11.0
Social Studies	4	6.0	2	2.0
Exercises and Games	3	4.5	5	6.0
Music/Rhythm	3	4.5	7	7.5
Arithmetic	2	3.0	3	4.0
Health and Hygiene	1	1.5	1	1.0
Science	1	1.5	3	4.0

a. Number of codings, Observation 1, was 452.

b. Number of codings, Observation 3, was 538.

demonstrating something to the children (24%, or about 47% of adult interactions). Children were observed playing or working alone 30 percent of the time and in contact with their peers 15 percent of the time.

PROSE data summarized in Table 1-2 indicate that children were attentive and doing what they were supposed to be doing, i.e., were cooperative (87%) and using materials in ways appropriate to their age and instructional objectives. Little divergent or original use of materials were observed.

Preschoolers showed relatively little physical locomotion within the classrooms. Observers coded only 14 percent of such activities as walking or running about the room. About 22 percent of physical activity was coded moderately active without locomotion, indicating children were observed moving parts of their body, for example, swinging a leg while sitting at a table or moving their hand or looking around while in the circle group. The largest proportion of time, however, observers coded the activity level as low (41%) with children sitting or standing quietly. The classroom climate was most frequently observed as "quiet" but one in which children were busy (45%).

Instructional activities categories are presented in Table 1-3. In this first period of observation, specific instructional activities in the Basic program centered on Language, with Arts and Crafts and Social Skills activities less emphasized but more so than Social Studies, Science and Arithmetic. These latter two areas were observed less than three percent of the observation time. Other instructional areas that were observed infrequently as specific activities were Exercises and Games, Health and Hygiene and Music and Rhythm.

The PROSE data indicated that about one-fifth of the observations of classroom activity were coded as "Free Play" (19%), 16 percent as Rest and Snack time, and 15 percent as time children were involved in Routine and Transitional activities. These

seem to be large percentages in what could be interpreted to be noninstructional activities. However, this may well not be the case. Rest and snack time can be used by teachers to do considerable teaching regarding color, shape, vocabulary, social relationships, and verbal expressiveness. In addition, skill in the use of foods and containers can promote eye-hand coordination as well as a sense of competence and of making a contribution to the work of the class. In a similar fashion, routines provide learning opportunities. As children line up, the concepts of before, behind, the ordinal numbers, and numerical quantity can be promoted. Such experiences as following directions, learning to be patient while waiting one's turn, and the like, may be considered helpful to children in coming to accept some of the requirements of cooperative activity.

Nonetheless, Program Staff generally responded with a concern to reduce the amount of time being spent in these ways.

In summary, the PROSE data indicate that, after about two months of operation, the Basic program was providing children with a variety of activities. Many observations indicated time spent in what may be experiential learning — Free Play, Rest/Eating, and Routine/Transition. A significant fraction of time (12%) was spent in Language. Arts and Crafts, Social Skills, Sensory, and Social Studies were somewhat less emphasized, but perhaps more so than others. The reader should be reminded again that the differences have not been tested for significance. The bulk of observations indicated that students spend more time in groups with adults than in other interaction, or by themselves. Most of these contacts are with teachers, and most of the teacher's activities are instructional. Most of the observations found the students busy, and more often quiet than noisy.

The Basic Program in April, 1971 — Observational data across the eight Basic classrooms combined for the first and third observational periods are summarized in Tables 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3.

In making comparisons between the first and third observational data or in using these data for describing programs, it is important to remember that the percentage of codings in these tables are based upon a large number of observations — at least 450 in November and at least 530 in April. Therefore, small percentage differences across time might be considered to represent relatively significant data for purposes of description. However, since tests of statistical significance were not applied to these data, the description and comparisons based on them must be interpreted cautiously and within this context. Data in Table 1-1 indicate that organizational and structural features of the Basic program changed relatively little during the program year. From the first to the last observation period, the majority of interactions in the classrooms continued to be primarily between children and adults, usually involving the teacher. Children's contacts with teacher aides appeared to be slightly less frequent than at the beginning of the program (reducing from 14% to 9% of observations). There was some slight increase over time (30% to 37%) in the frequency that children were observed working or playing by themselves.

Adult patterns of responses to children in Basic classrooms did not show marked changes during the program year. What changes were observed appeared to be congruent with what might be anticipated as children grow older and become adapted to the classroom setting. The most frequent activity of the adults in the room (usually the teacher) appeared to be instructional, i.e., showing and telling the children about something, just as it had been at the beginning of the program year. However, there was some slight decrease in the frequency of this behavior (from 24% in November to 19% in

April) and an increase (from 2% to 9%) in the frequencies of adult responses permitting or providing children with opportunity to make choices.

In performing their classroom tasks, children's behavior was consistently coded as highly cooperative in both the first and last observation , 87% in November and 86% in April (see Table 1-2).

In the use of classroom materials children continued to use them principally in the way they were intended to be used, just as had been indicated in November. There was no increase in divergent use of materials.

There were some changes indicated in the level of physical activity of children in classrooms. Children were much less frequently observed at "low" activity level (frequency reduced from 41% to 18%) and there was an increase in coding of moderate activity (from 22% to 60%). This increase may be attributable, in part at least, to some revision in the definition of moderate activity as actually used by observers. There was a decided absence of negative feeling or affect as indicated in Table 1-2 in both observations. There was marked increase, however, from the first to third observation in the frequency of codings (from 4% to 12%) indicating an overall positive quality to children's experience in the classroom. (It is possible that this increase may have been given impetus by observers increasing familiarity with the ECE setting and increasing awareness of expressions of positive affect among the children.)

Some changes in the distribution of observations did appear in instructional categories, as presented in Table 1-3. Language went up from 12% to 19% of the instructional codings, and Sensory increased from 5% to 13%. Free Play decreased about 6%. There <u>appears</u> to be a decrease in Rest/Eating, and there in fact is. However, this is probably due more to a decision to discontinue observing during the meal period subsequent to the first Observation than to that marked a decrease in the total amount of time devoted to Rest/Eating.

In summary, the distribution of classroom activities, conditions, and events is similar for the third observation and the first. Teachers appear to demonstrate and inform less, while giving more opportunity for student choice. Somewhat more use may be made of total classroom groups. More contacts involve materials. Physical activity may be at a higher level, and the students may be somewhat more noisy while being busy. More time seems to be spent on Language and on Sensory instructional activities. There seem to be more strongly positive feeling experiences for the students.

The Montessori Program in November, 1970 -- In describing the Montessori program, the PROSE description of the Basic program will be frequently used as a point of reference, particularly in those areas where differences in program intent and orientation would seem to suggest corresponding differences in PROSE percentage distributions.

However, it must be noted that the numbers of observations upon which the percentage of codings is based for Montessori classrooms is much less than those for the 8 Basic classrooms. For the first and third observations, approximately 500 and 840 separate events respectively were coded in Montessori classrooms in contrast to 2,260 in November and 2,690 in April, 1971, made in Basic classrooms. Thus, differences between these two programs in percentage of PROSE codings must be interpreted somewhat more cautiously.

PROSE data for the Montessori program are summarized in Tables 1-4, 1-5, and 1-6. These data for the first observation indicate that children in both the morning and afternoon Montessori classrooms were working or playing by themselves almost half of the observation time (48%), that they were observed in some kind of interaction with adults in the classroom about 40 percent of the time and with their classmates in some kind of contact approximately 10 percent of the observation period.

Table 1-4

Structural and Organizational Features of the Montessori ECE Program as Indicated in Percentage Distribution of PROSE Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observational Periods

PROSE Categories	% of Observations	
	Observation 1	Observation 3
Child interacts or has contact[a,b]		
with an adult	40%	38%
with another child	10	14
with no one (observed alone)	48	48
With an adult[a,b]		
as participant in adult led group	22%	26%
as star (center of adult's attention)	6	8
by initiating contact	2	2
Adults with whom child interacts[a,b]		
Teacher	29%	29%
Teacher aides	5	7
Other	6	2
Adult's classroom behavior toward child[a,b]		
Teacher permits choices	1%	3%
Demonstrates and informs	23	15
Listens to and questions children	3	9
Does things for child	4	4
Controls/manages children's behavior	8	6
Other	0	0
Grouping of adults and children in classroom[c,d]		
One child with adult	2%	6%
Two children with adult	8	8
Three to five with adult	10	10
Six or more with adult	11	2
All children with adult	26	23
Children in groups without adult[c,d]		
One child	9%	17%
Two	12	15
Three to five	10	15
Six or more	0	0
All children	0	0

a. Number of codings, Observation 1, was 500.

b. Number of codings, Observation 3, was 840.

c. Number of codings, Observation 1, was 100.

d. Number of codings, Observation 3, was 168.

As indicated in Table 1-4, when the children in Montessori classrooms were interacting with adults it was most frequently as a participant in an adult led group (22% of all observations) with slightly more than half (55%) of observed child-adult contacts occurring in this context. This is in contrast to 38 percent of such observations in the Basic program, representing almost three-fourths (72%) of child-adult interactions. In both programs, the adult behavior in interactions with children was most frequently coded as instructional, i.e., demonstrating or giving information to the children (58% of child-adult contacts in Montessori classrooms and 45% in Basic classrooms were coded in this category).

In Montessori classrooms, child contacts with adults were observed to be outside the formal adult led group situation somewhat more frequently than in the regular ECE program as indicated in Table 1-4.

Table 1-5 summarizes PROSE data concerned with children's behavior and experiences in the classroom setting. The data indicate that 90 percent of the children's classroom behavior was coded as cooperative. The children's use of materials was highly appropriate, i.e., they used materials in the way they were supposed to be used (73% of the time children were using materials). There was no observation of children using materials to express fantasy such as using a pitcher and cups to play house, etc. This is partly because observers were cautioned that such uses, in the Montessori program, are part of the intended Practical Life experiences.

Because children were observed alone in activities more than in the regular program, they were observed less frequently experiencing physical and material contact with others.

Table 1-5

Children's Responses and Experiences in the Montessori Program as Indicated in Percentage Distributions of PROSE Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observations

PROSE Categories	% of Observations	
	Observation 1	Observation 3
Child's response to adult and classroom setting[a,b]		
Is cooperative	90%	90%
Is distracted	4	5
Responding to own needs (day dreaming)	1	2
Is disruptive to class	0	0
Working on another activity		
Child's individual use of material in classroom[a,b]		
Is in fantasy	0%	1%
Is different or divergent	4	1
Is conventional or convergent	19	30
Is in work-cleanup	3	4
Child's activity level is[a,b]		
High to moderate including running or walking	12%	23%
Moderate with no locomotion	26	67
Low, sitting or standing with very little movement	24	7
Classroom climate — children are[c,d]		
Attentive and excited	0%	2%
Noisy and excited	0	1
Noisy and busy	22	29
Quiet and busy	60	58
Quiet and idle	0	5
Child interacts with peers[a,b]		
by initiating contact	5%	2%
in an aggressive way	0	0
in a cooperative way	5	12
by resisting or withdrawing	0	0
Child's contacts with others[a,b]		
Physical contact (touching-holding)	3%	4%
Exchange or use of materials	12	28
Verbal communications	34	12
Children's experiences in classroom[a,b]		
are strongly positive	1%	4%
are strongly negative	0	0

a. Number of codings, Observation 1, was 500.
b. Number of codings, Observation 3, was 840.
c. Number of codings, Observation 1, was 100.
d. Number of codings, Observation 3, was 168.

In observation of instructional areas, PROSE data indicate that Montessori children work with numbers (Arithmetic - 11%) more frequently than in the Basic program (2%). The most pronounced program difference in emphasis is seen in the 29 percent of codings for sensory instruction in Montessori classrooms in contrast to 5 percent for the Basic program. Another prominent difference is the absence of any "Free Play" time in Montessori classrooms in contrast to 19 percent for the Basic program. Like the Basic program, Language instruction ranked among the instructional activities most frequently coded. Arts and Crafts (4%), Science (1%), and Social Studies (3%) ranked among the lowest frequencies of observed activities in the first observation. Like the Basic classrooms, Montessori in the first observation period indicated a relatively high proportion of time spent in Rest and Snack time (14%) and Routine/Transition activity (16%) and a relatively small proportion in Exercises and Games, Health and Hygiene or Music/Rhythm activities.

In Table 1-6 PROSE data on percentage distribution of frequency of instructional activities for Observation 1 and 3 are summarized.

In summary, the PROSE data indicate that, after two months in operation, the Montessori program was focussing a significant fraction of classroom activity upon sensory learning (29%) and, in addition, upon language development (11%) and working with numbers (Arithmetic - 11%). Many observations indicate a significant fraction of time was also spent in activities coded Rest/Eating or Routine/Transition on the PROSE. The PROSE data, as analyzed in this evaluation, do not permit examining how such activity relates to the "Practical Life" curriculum of the Montessori program although it appears probable that it does. There were no observations of "Free Play" time in the Montessori classrooms. The bulk of observations indicated that the classroom climate was one of children being busy and more often quiet than they were noisy and more frequently working alone than in adult led activities or in contacts with their peers.

Table 1-6

Rank Order of the Percentage Distributions of the PROSE Instructional Categories for the November, 1970 and April, 1971 Observations of Montessori Classrooms

PROSE Instructional Activity Categories	November 1970 1st PROSE[a]		April 1971 3rd PROSE[b]	
	%	Rank	%	Rank
Sensory	29%	13.0	18%	13.0
Routine/transition	16	12.0	8	7.5
Rest/snack	14	11.0	13	11.5
Language	11	9.5	13	11.5
Arithmetic	11	9.5	10	9.0
Social Skills	9	8.0	6	6.0
Arts and Craft	4	7.0	15	12.0
Social Studies	3	6.0	*	2.5
Health and Hygiene	2	5.0	*	2.5
Science	1	3.5	8	7.5
Free Play	1	3.5	*	2.5
Exercise and games	*	2.0	*	2.5
Music/rhythm	0	1.0	5	5.0

*Less than one percent.

a. Number of codings, Observation 1, was 100.

b. Number of codings, Observation 3, was 168.

Montessori Program in April, 1971 — Looking at the Montessori program over the two observations in terms of PROSE data shows some relatively consistent patterns but also some differences in program emphasis.

As indicated in Table 1-4, in the third observation, children continued to spend more classroom time working by themselves (48%) than they spent attending to or interacting with adults (38%) or with their peers (14%).

In their interactions with children, the adult activities (most usually the teacher) continued to be primarily instructional, i.e., demonstrating or giving information to the children, although there was some decrease in this (23% to 15%). There was some increase in the teacher's listening to and questioning children in her interactions with them.

Structural and organizational features of the Montessori program in the April observation appeared similar to those recorded in the November observation. In classroom activities children continued to be almost as frequently involved in single or small group units with or without adults than in larger groups of six or more children.

Children were more frequently observed working individually with materials than in the earlier observation (from 26% in November to 36% in April), and they continued to use materials in conventional ways, i.e., as they had been taught to use them. There continued to be almost no fantasy play with materials in the classroom or with materials in ways that could be identified as divergent or unconventional. Their classroom behavior continued to be coded most frequently as cooperative.

The classroom climate in April was more frequently coded noisy and busy than before (29% in November, 33% in April) although the "Quiet and Busy" category continued to be most frequently coded by observers. Considerably more frequent observations of children moving about the room were coded in April as was a general increase in the physical activity level.

During the program year changes in instructional emphasis were indicated primarily in three areas coded in the PROSE. As shown in Table 1-6, Arts and Crafts, Science and Music/Rhythm activities showed increases, while activities involving children in Routine and/or Transition from one activity to another showed some decrease. Arts and Crafts, showing the most substantial increase, was coded 4 percent of the observation time in November and 15 percent in April; Science instruction increased in frequency from 1 percent to 8 percent and Music/Rhythm from no codings at all to 5 percent in April.

These changes in emphasis accompanied some reduction in the frequencies of Sensory instruction and time involved in Routine and Transition. However, Sensory instruction remained the most frequent area observed in April just as it had in November, 1970. Instruction in Language and Arithmetic showed relatively little increase or decrease in their frequency from the first to the last observation.

Differences between Montessori and the Basic program in PROSE data suggests differences in the relative emphasis upon certain kinds of classroom structures, organizations and adult roles. Contrasting the PROSE data of both programs for Observation 1 and Observation 3 provides a basis for assessing what intended activities actually took place during the program year. In Table 1-7, the results of contrasting the two programs on PROSE dimensions for the first and third observation are summarized. In this table only those PROSE categories are identified which showed both Montessori classrooms as being coded more or less frequently than at least six of the eight Basic classrooms.

These indicated patterns of differences between the Basic and Montessori programs suggest differences in direction or focus that might be expected in terms of statements concerning intended program objectives and curriculum activities. It must again be noted that differences in percentages have not been tested for significance. However, the

Table 1-7

Comparison of Montessori and Basic Classes on PROSE Categories for Two Observation Periods

PROSE Category	Categories on which both Montessori Classrooms were Higher (H) or Lower (L) than Six or More Basic Classrooms	
	Observation 1	Observation 2
Child's interpersonal contacts		
with an adult	L	L
with no one by self	H	H
with adult in group		L
with teacher		L
Adult's classroom behavior		
Teacher permits choices		L
Shows and tells children		L
Listen and asks questions	L	
Does things for children	L	L
Focus of classroom activity		
Arithmetic	H	H
Arts and Crafts		H
Science		H
Sensory	H	H
Exercise and Games	L	
FreePlay	L	L
Rest/Eating		H
Music and Rhythm	L	
Grouping of adults and children		
One child with adult	H	H
Two children with adult		H
Six or more with adult		L
All children with an adult	L	L
Grouping of children without adult		
One child	H	H
Two children	H	H
Three to five	H	H
Six or more	H	H
Interaction with peers is cooperative		H
Nature of contacts with adults and peers		
Involves physical contacts	L	
Involves materials — exchange or use of	L	
Involves verbal exchange		L

Table 1-7

PROSE Category	Categories on which both Montessori Classrooms were Higher (H) or Lower (L) than Six or More Basic Classrooms	
	Observation 1	Observation 2
Physical activity levels in classroom are		
Moderate without locomotion		H
Low level physical activity with no locomotion	L	
Child's use of materials in classroom		
Child observed using materials	H	H
Child uses material for fantasy play	L	L
Child uses materials in divergent way		L
Child uses materials in conventional way		H
Classroom climate — children are		
Attentive and excited	H	
Noisy and excited	L	L
Noisy and busy		L
Quiet and busy	H	H
Quiet and idle	L	

differences indicated by (H) higher, and (L) lower are based upon the observed differences in percentage distributions of the two Montessori classrooms in the same directions, i.e., both (H) higher or both (L) lower than the majority (6 of the 8) Basic classrooms. Therefore, these patterns of differences appear worthy of note in the context of differences which might be expected from statements of program objectives and intended program activities.

With due considerations for limitations in the data, the following patterns of differences between the Basic and Montessori classrooms are suggested:

The Montessori program in April, 1971, was characterized by children working alone more frequently than with adults or in adult led group activities as was the case with the Basic program.

Considerably greater focus upon Sensory and academic areas (Arithmetic and Science) characterized Montessori classrooms. There was less Exercise and Games, Free Play and Music and Rhythm than in the Basic program. There was increased emphasis in activities coded Rest/Eating which may represent the Montessori's emphasis upon practical life experience as part of their curriculum (serving food, drink; preparing it).

There was greater emphasis upon individuals working with materials directly and there was no use of materials in fantasy play.

c. What Are Some of the Differences in the Basic Program as It was Developed by Different Teachers?

The analyses of PROSE data included comparisons of classrooms on PROSE categories. The data used in these comparisons were the percentage distributions for PROSE categories on Observation 3. These data are in Table 1-8.

Table 1-8

Average Percent of PROSE Codings by Category for Eight Basic Classrooms and Range Across Classrooms for Observation 3

PROSE Categories	Observation 3	
	% for Total Group	Range of % within 8 Classes
Child interacts or has contact		
with an adult	51	(41-60)
with another child	11	(8-16)
with no one (observed alone)	37	(30-45)
With an adult		
as participant in adult led group	40	(27-49)
as star (center of adult's attention)	8	(6-12)
Adult with whom child interacts		
Teacher	34	(23-42)
Teacher aides	16	(3-16)
Other		
Adult's classroom behavior toward child		
Teacher or adult permits choice	9	(5-15)
Demonstrates to and informs	19	(15-38)
Listens to and questions	10	(4-17)
Does things for child	6	(3- 8)
Controls/manages child's behavior	6	(3- 8)
Grouping of adults and children in classroom		
One child with adult	2	(0- 5)
Two children with adult	4	(1- 9)
Three to five with adult	11	(5-18)
Six or more	8	(3-14)
All children with adult	51	(40-62)
Children in groups without adult		
One child	1	(1-14)
Two	5	(1- 8)
Three to five	5	(1-11)
Six or more	2	(2- 6)
All children in group	0	(0- 0)
Child's contacts with others involves		
Physical contact (touching-holding)	5	(2- 9)
Exchange or use of materials	28	(17-37)
Verbal communication	30	(17-37)

Table 1-8

PROSE Categories	Observation 3 % for Total Group	Observation 3 Range of % within 8 Classes
Child's physical activity level is		
High to moderate including running or walking	19	(13-29)
Moderate with no locomotion	60	(37-80)
Low (sitting or standing with very little movement	18	(3-37)
Child's response to adult and classroom setting		
Is cooperative	86	(81-89)
Is distracted	6	(3- 8)
Is responding to own needs (day dreaming)	3	(1- 7)
Is disruptive to class	1	(0- 2)
Is working on different, self-initiated activity	2	(1- 6)
Child's individual use of material		
Is in fantasy	4	(2-10)
Is different or divergent	7	(0-13)
Is convergent or conventional use	10	(3-21)
Is in work-cleanup	3	(0- 6)
Classroom climate — children are		
Attentive and excited	3	(0- 9)
Noisy and excited	9	(3-17)
Noisy and busy	39	(22-49)
Quiet and busy	35	(14-58)
Quiet and idle	9	(3-31)
PROSE Instructional Activities		
Free Play	13	(6-22)
Rest/Eating	7	(0-15)
Routine/Transition	13	(5-22)
Language	19	(9-41)
Arts and Crafts	10	(2-18)
Social Skills	13	(0- 5)
Sensory	13	(8-22)
Social Studies	2	(1- 4)
Exercises and Games	5	(1-11)
Music/Rhythm	7	(1-12)
Arithmetic	3	(0- 6)
Health and Hygiene	1	(0- 5)
Science	3	(0- 7)

The first category considered is whom the child is interacting with. In all the Basic classrooms, children's interactions tended to be primarily with adults, ranging from 41% to 60%, with the average at 51%. In fact, there was no overlap in any of these classes of the amount of interaction with other children being as large as that with adults. However, in all these classes, children spent more time working alone than with other children.

PROSE data indicate that in all eight Basic classrooms, child-adult contacts occurred mainly in teacher-led group activity. There were variations from classroom to classroom with percentages ranging from slightly better than one-fourth of the time (27%) to about half of the time (49%). Classrooms also varied in the amount of time children were observed in contact with their teacher (23% to 42%). In some classrooms children were experiencing contacts with aides considerably more than in other classrooms. In one class children were involved with aides 3 percent of the time in contrast to 16 percent for children in another room.

Teacher's classroom behavior toward the child varied across subcategories and across classes. Showing and informing children was the most frequent response of teachers to children in all classrooms. Differences were indicated in the frequency of teacher's listening to and questioning them. In one classroom almost one-third of the teacher's interactions with children were of this kind; in another class only one-tenth of the teacher's interactions with children were like this.

The group structures of different classrooms also differed to some extent. The range of percentages for observations of small groups (one to two children) in adult-led activity varied from 0 to 5 percent and for group size of three to five children from 5 to 18 percent. Classrooms differed in their emphasis upon small, adult-led groups and large, adult led groups, although all Basic classrooms were most frequently observed in (40% to 62%) activities involving all children in the classroom with an adult.

There were rather wide differences among classrooms in group sizes without adults involved. In one classroom 14 percent of observations were coded as small group (1 child) without adult (ranging from 1 to 14%). In another classroom there were only 1 percent of observations of such small groups without adults.

The nature of contact with others varied considerably across classes, particularly in the use of materials and amount of verbal communication. Since this category was coded in a hierarchical fashion, it is possible that more total contact included materials or verbal interaction. If the contact included both physical and materials or verbal communication, only physical was coded. If the contact was both with materials and verbal communication, only materials was coded.

In some classes there was more than twice as much contact with materials (37% to 17%) as in other classes. The same was true for verbal communication.

The amount of physical activity observed varied markedly across classes. In one class, nearly three in 10 observations (29%) recorded movement about. One class recorded only a little more than one in 10 (13%). Moderate activity (without moving from his place) varied from 37% to 80%. The observations of low movement varied from less than one in 20 (3%)in one class to more than 7 in 20 (37%) in another.

The basic response style of children to the class included doing what was expected, labeled cooperative. They were seldom disruptive or daydreaming. The vast majority of responses were cooperative, and range was narrow, from 81 to 89%. Given that fact, not many responses could be in other subcategories.

In their use of materials, most children tended to be conventional. There was some variation across classes, with fantasy uses ranging from 2 to 10%. Different or divergent uses also varied from 0 to 12% across classes.

Some differences in classroom climate were indicated in the PROSE data collected in April, 1971. Noisy and busy periods were the most frequent categories coded by observers but the range of percentage coded for this category were from 22 to 49 percent. The range of codings for quiet and busy ranged from 58 percent to 14 percent in one classroom. This latter classroom had the highest frequency of codings in "quiet and idle" (14%) and "noisy excited" (10%), and in "attentive excited" (9%). The classroom coded most frequently as "Busy Quiet" (58%) was least frequently coded "Quiet and Idle" (3%).

Instructional activities among the 8 classrooms showed rather wide range frequency of occurrence in some areas. In most classrooms there was relatively little instructional activity in Arithmetic, in Health and Hygiene, in Science or in Physical Exercises and Games. Language development was the instructional area most frequently coded in the Third PROSE observation but classrooms varied markedly in their emphasis with percentages ranging from 9 percent to 41 percent. Sensory instruction and Arts and Crafts were two other instructional areas most frequently coded. Differences between classrooms in program focus is indicated by the range of percentages from 8 to 22 percent and from 2 to 18 percent respectively for Sensory and Arts and Crafts activities.

Some differences in PROSE data were found among the 8 classrooms in the frequency of "Free Play" time indicated. In one classroom almost a fourth of the observations of activities were coded in this area while in another classroom 6 percent of activities were coded "Free Play." There was considerable variation in the amount of time involved in Rest and Eating periods (the range was 0 to 15%) and in time required for Routine and Transitional activities (5% to 22%).

In substance, classrooms comprising the Basic program show some differences in group structure and instructional activities as well as in teacher's classroom behavior.

Differences were particularly manifest in the way classroom time was used. Differences were observed in teacher's response to children reflecting differences in teaching style and possibly reflecting an orientation toward a particular method of teaching preschoolers.

In examining the PROSE data across classrooms, the limitations of the data processing procedures developed by the Educational Testing Service to this point became apparent. Given the amount of information and the variation it is difficult to define patterns which characterize some classroom learning settings and activities from others. This problem will be dealt with next.

PROSE Description of Early Childhood Education Orientation. To identify among the sample classrooms the kinds of differences observed in the PROSE data that might be associated with program outcomes, PROSE data were examined along several dimensions. These dimensions were selected, in part, on the basis of a paper written by Ruth Ekstrom which suggested the relevance of certain PROSE categories for identifying differences in ECE orientations. They were also selected on the basis of their relevance to ECE program objectives. Since instructional focus and classroom activity appear to reflect certain basic ECE orientations, PROSE data were surveyed and classrooms were identified in terms of their major instructional emphasis.

Specific PROSE categories which appeared logically to belong together in terms of Program orientations were combined. This analysis permitted the identification of four different patterns of instructional emphasis based primarily on PROSE codings of instructional activities. These patterns are:

1. The academic orientation — relatively high total percentage of codings in language, arithmetic, science.
2. The sensory-perceptual orientation — high percentage of codings in sensory instruction.
3. Enrichment-exploratory — high percentage of codings in Free Play, Music/Rhythm, Arts/Crafts, average, at least, in Language and Sensory.

4. Mixed — not clearly differentiated; no special instructional emphasis; relatively high in Rest/Eating, Routine/Transition. (In developing this category, other than instructional activities were reviewed to determine whether the lack of pattern was pervasive. This was found to be the case.)

Classrooms falling into these categories were then contrasted on a number of PROSE dimensions to identify common program elements within these categories that might be associated with differential outcomes and to identify unique program characteristics of classrooms showing similar orientations which might be associated with outcomes.

Table 1-9 summarized the results of rank ordering each sample classroom from highest to lowest on each of a number of PROSE categories and dimensions. In this table the letters H, M and L are used to mean High, Middle and Low, respectively, in terms of their rank order. Within the table the 8 classrooms comprising the Basic program have been identified by letters which were assigned after they were classified in terms of one of the four orientations listed above. They were assigned to a specific category on the basis of the percentage distribution of codings in the PROSE instructional activity category.

For purpose of discussion and comparison, the Basic classrooms are lettered A through H with A and B identifying the two Basic classrooms showing the academic orientation; C the Basic classroom showing the sensory orientation, D and E an exploratory enrichment orientation and F, G and H those classrooms where program emphasis is not clear. I and J are the two Montessori classrooms.

From this table, differences and similarities in PROSE codings within and between orientations can be identified. The two Basic classrooms, A and B, showing academic orientation show similarities in other codings on PROSE. There is relatively limited use of class time for non-academic activity, including the adult's time taken for housekeeping chores. Both showed limited Free Play activity with B showing the lowest emphases

Table 1-9

Head Start/Model Cities Early Childhood Education Classroom Orientation
PROSE Description — April, 1971

PROSE Dimensions	Basic Program								Montessori Program	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Focus of classroom activity										
Academic work (language, arithmetic, science)	H	H	L	L	M	M	L	L	H	M
Sensory learning	L	H	H	M	L	M	L	L	H	H
Free play	M	L	H	H	H	M	M	M	L	L
Non-academic activity	L	L	L	L	M	M	H	H	M	M
Adult role in classroom										
Demonstrating	H	L	M	L	M	L	L	L	H	H
Informing	H	L	M	M	M	L	L	L	H	H
Managing	H	M	M	H	M	L	L	M	H	H
Supervising	M	L	H	M	M	M	H	L	H	M
Housekeeping	L	L	M	H	L	H	M	H	L	H
Listening and watching	M	M	H	L	H	L	M	M	M	L
Discussion with children	H	H	M	H	L	M	M	L	L	L
Grouping of children and adults in classroom										
Single child units with or without adult	M	L	M	H	M	M	L	M	H	H
Group activities led by adult	H	H	H	M	M	M	M	M	L	L
Group activities without adult	M	L	L	M	H	L	L	M	H	H
Interactions of child in classroom										
Emphasis on adult-child	M	H	H	M	M	H	M	L	L	L
Emphasis on peer interaction	L	L	M	L	H	M	L	M	H	M
Children work or play alone	M	L	L	M	M	L	M	M	H	H

H = High % rank relative to total group of classes.
M = Average or medium % rank.
L = Low % rank relative to total group.

in this area of all the Basic classrooms. Both A and B emphasized group activities led by adults and in both classrooms there was little emphasis upon interaction. The adult role in the classroom differed in certain aspects. While adults in classroom B used discussion with children, adults in class A demonstrated and informed children. In terms of other instructional activities, classroom B emphasized sensory learning while classroom A showed relatively little emphasis in this area.

On the 17 PROSE variables selected for study, classrooms A and B showed relatively similar patterns of percentage of codings on five of the 17 variables. They showed marked dissimilarity on three.

The one classroom, C, that appeared to be strongly oriented toward sensory/perceptual activities, was quite unlike the other classrooms (B, I and J) that also emphasized sensory learning experience in the classroom. Classroom C, while similar to these others in sensory emphasis differed from them in focusing upon Free Play as the major classroom activity.

The two classrooms identified as showing an exploratory enrichment orientation, D and E, primarily because of their relatively high pattern of codings in the PROSE Free Play category, actually showed very little similarity in other PROSE patterns. They were completely different in scores on four of the 17 variables and showed no other similar emphasis in classroom activity, structure or instructional role of the teacher.

When the Montessori classrooms are contrasted, it is evident that there is much closer congruence in their patterns of percentage distributions than any other two classes. This might be expected with the same teacher in both classrooms. However, the pattern of similarities appears to be what would be expected in the implementation of the Montessori orientation, i.e., both classrooms show patterns focussing time on sensory and academic activities in the context of individualized, single and small unit work activity groups.

In summary, while classrooms appear to be distinguishable in terms of the focus of their instructional activity, these do not appear to be associated with other PROSE dimensions such as group structure or instructional role of the adult. The only exception to this would appear to be the Montessori classrooms.

d. What Sites Were Utilized and What Programs Were Offered at Each?

Classes to be evaluated were selected randomly from an a.m. and p.m. alphabetical listing of the teachers' names. Four were selected from the a.m. listing and four from the p.m. listing. To these eight were added the two Montessori classes, one a.m. and one p.m. This provided a total of ten classes for evaluation.

The ten sample classrooms are, in most respects, representative of the Early Childhood Education/Head Start Program sites. Five were Early Childhood classes, four at the Swope Parkway Center and one in Wheatley Elementary School; and five were Head Start classes; initially three at the Banneker Center and one each at Greenwood and Dunbar Elementary Schools. The latter class was transferred to the Banneker Center in January. Early Childhood Education/Head Start classes are located in a total of eight sites, but they serve at least part of the attendance areas of at least 20 elementary schools. Due to program arrangements and bus schedules, many children do not attend the site closest to their homes. This creates a greater mix of ethnic and socioeconomic groups in each site.

Locations. The Swope Parkway Center is located in a recently constructed elementary school which has been converted for preschool use. It is located out of the Model neighborhood area so all children are transported. The Center serves approximately 310 children enrolled in the 16 classes which include 42 children in the two Montessori classes and a maximum of 16 in two small classes for children with learning difficulties. The sample group at this site included two regular classes and the two Montessori classes. The offices of the education director of the Early Childhood Program and the parent participation coordinator are also located in the building.

The building has three floors. Classrooms are located on the top and middle level. The lower level is a large, multipurpose room used as a cafeteria, meeting

room, and play area for children in inclement weather. A small, fenced, playground is located behind the building. There are limited food preparation facilities so the hot lunches are catered.

The eight classrooms are newly painted and of a uniform size which is adequate for small and large group instruction but not for many exercise and game activities. The playground and multipurpose room are used for those activities. All the rooms, except the Montessori class, are uniformly furnished with colorful tables, chairs, and a variety of instructional equipment. The Montessori class is outfitted with furniture and equipment designed for that program. Toilets are located outside the rooms at the west end of each hall.

Wheatley Elementary School is a recently constructed single story building with a declining enrollment. It is located in a Model neighborhood. Some of the preschool children walk to school; however, many are transported. Approximately 170 were enrolled in the eight preschool classes at Wheatley. One of these was a sample class. The office of the director of the Early Childhood/Head Start Program is also located in the building. The school has an enrollment of about 550 children in grades K-6 and special education. There are several unoccupied classrooms in the building. The school cafeteria prepares the hot lunches. The school is surrounded on three sides by a large playground which contains the standard elementary school equipment — bars, jungle gym, painted circles, and hopscotch squares. There is also a large combination gym/auditorium in the building.

The four preschool classrooms are extremely small for the number of children enrolled. They are well-furnished, and there are toilets and a closet storage area in each room.

The Banneker Center is an old two story elementary school converted for pre-school use. It is located in a Model neighborhood; however, extensive urban renewal in the area has decimated the population. Most of the children are transported to the school from other parts of town. Approximated 200 children were assigned to the 11 preschool classes. This includes eight children in one small class for children with learning difficulties. The sample group included three, later four, regular classes at Banneker. The office of the education director of Head Start and the administrative offices of the Institute for Pupil Studies were also located at Banneker.

This older building has a variety of room sizes and shapes and a combination of narrow and wide corridors. The classrooms are located on both levels. The cafeteria, where catered hot lunches are served, and the toilets are located on the lower floor. A large gymnasium/auditorium, which is also used for meeting and furniture storage, is on the upper level. There is a fenced playground with standard elementary school equipment to the south of the school.

Of the four sample classrooms, one was a large former kindergarten room, two were standard size classrooms and one was a long narrow room on the lower level. Although adequate furniture was provided for all rooms, there was great variety in the quantity and type in each room.

Greenwood Elementary School is an old, three story building, located in a Model Cities neighborhood. Most of the preschool children assigned to the building lived in the Greenwood attendance area, and many walked to school. About 80 children attended the four preschool classes there: one was a sample class. The school has an enrollment of about 790 in grades K-6. The school cafeteria prepared hot lunches for the children. There is a large, fenced playground on three sides of the school with standard elementary school equipment and a gymnasium.

The two preschool classes were in adjoining rooms on the lower level. The cafeteria and toilets were also on that level; but, due to the construction of the building with no clear passageway on that level, the children had to pass through another class to reach the toilets and to climb stairs and then go down again to get to the cafeteria. The rooms were somewhat larger than standard classroom size and were well furnished but with a variety of types of furniture. The sample classroom was partly below ground level and received limited sunlight from its north-facing windows.

Dunbar Elementary School is located in an area surrounded by freeways or main traffic arteries. It is a very new single story school in an area of declining enrollment. In September, there were four preschool classes enrolling about 80 children, nearly all transported. The total enrollment of the school was about 130 in grades K-7. Several of the rooms were used for other programs and projects. The school has a cafeteria; a large, fenced yard; and a gymnasium. The two preschool classrooms were large, well-lighted rooms with toilets and adequate storage space. One full-time and two half-day preschool teachers were assigned to the building. The sample class, an afternoon session, was transferred to Banneker in January.

There was great variety in the facilities at different sites. No site was viewed as ideal for none contained all the elements desirable for efficient operation. In most respects, the consolidated centers appear to be preferable. They permit the implementation of administrative goals and decisions which are formulated for the education of preschool children. This is not possible in a building where the children's ages range from 4 to 14. It would also be possible in a consolidated center to provide building facilities, such as toilets in each room, and specialized equipment, i.e., creative playground apparatus, especially designed for preschool age children. These were not available this year, however.

The major disadvantage of the consolidated center is its location. In order to maintain an adequate enrollment, the centers must be located outside the neighborhood of most of the children who attend. This is not a problem of whether children should be bussed to school since all preschool children who live five or more blocks from school or cross a busy street are already bussed. It is a question of how far they should be bussed and the affect the distance has on their parent's involvement with the school.

Whether the preschool classroom is in a consolidated center or a neighborhood school, the location of the facilities within the building is an important factor. It would be ideal if each classroom were kindergarten size, with toilets and a sink in the room, a specially equipped playground right outside, and the cafeteria next door. None of the sample classrooms was like that.

e. What Were the Specific Factors at Each Site — Number of Classes, Pupil-Adult Ratios, etc.?

There was a great difference in the number of classes assigned to each site. The ECE Program operated two consolidated centers with 16 classes in one, 8 in the other. Head Start classes were located in one consolidated center, with 11 classes and in five elementary schools with two to eight classes each (see Table 1-10).

Pupil-adult ratios in the different classes are difficult to compute for a number of reasons. In general, fewer children were enrolled in the Head Start classrooms. They were limited to 20 while ECE classes were limited to 25 children. Few ECE classes, however, reached the maximum enrollment level during the year, and there were fluctuations in enrollments throughout the year in both programs.

There were differences in personnel assignments, too. All classes had one teacher and a classroom aide. The ECE classes had one additional paid aide while a volunteer aide was assigned to Head Start classes. In some cases, a volunteer aide was not

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1-10

Average Class Membership Early Childhood Education/Head Start
May, 1971

SITE	NUMBER CLASSES	AVERAGE MEMBERSHIP	SAMPLE	AVERAGE MEMBERSHIP
Swope Parkway Center	16	19	AM	17
			PM	18
			Mont. AM	23
			Mont. PM	19
Wheatley	8	21	AM	23
TOTAL ECE	24	20	5	20
Banneker	11	18	AM	17
			PM	19
			PM	15
			PM	19
Douglass	8	20		
Dunbar	3	20		
Garrison	2	17.5		
Greenwood	4	19.5	AM	20
Woodland	4	15		
TOTAL HEAD START	32	19	5	18
All Sites	56	19.5	10	19

available every day. The transportation aides were also assigned to assist in classrooms. Their assignment varied in the different locations but they were usually assigned to classes with the higher enrollments. The effective pupil-adult ratio in May ranged from six to one at Wheatley to four to one at Woodland — on the days when all children and classroom personnel were present.

The sample classes were representative of the extremes in the total program ranging from two ECE classes of 23 to a Head Start class of 15.

Question 2

To What Degree do Children Who Participate in Model Cities-sponsored Early Childhood Education Programs Grow Toward Stated Objectives?

a. Design for Assessment

To provide a good answer to the question above, it is necessary to isolate the impact of the program from other factors in the lives of the students. A really adequate design would require the identification of a large number of children who are eligible to participate. Some of these would be chosen randomly and assigned to the program; others would be randomly assigned to a comparison group which would not participate in the program. All children in the program and in the comparison group would be tested at the beginning of the program and again at the end. The differences between the change made by children in the program and the change made by children not in the program would indicate the effect of the program.

As is often the case, such procedures were deemed impossible. The goal of the program was to include all of the children in the Model Cities neighborhoods, thus eliminating any possible comparison population during the period of the program.

Discussions with Dr. Robert Stephenson of the School of Education, the University of Missouri — Kansas City, produced a decision to develop a procedure for predicting what student post-test scores would be had they not been involved in the program. This was done through a regression analysis with data from the Early Childhood Education (ECE) students and from kindergarten students with no pre-school experience. The following paragraphs will outline the procedures followed.

As students were brought to the various centers for registration, they were randomly assigned to the classrooms in that center. From a roster of the classes for typical students, eight classes were randomly chosen for evaluation purposes. The

two Montessori classes were also included to insure some program variation. (There were a few small classes reserved for students with particular learning needs. These were not studied in the same fashion as the rest of the classes. See Question 12 in this report dealing with the program for children with special needs.) In each of the ten classes, fifteen students were randomly selected for measurement. In a few cases more than fifteen students were measured initially to provide adequate data for the regression analysis which will be explained below.

From kindergarten classes in elementary public schools (in the same neighborhoods from which the ECE students came), students were identified who had not had preschool experience. The identification was done by teachers. Age, sex, parental employment (yes or no), and time of day attending kindergarten were used as stratification information. Approximately 120 kindergarten students were selected to provide bases for regression equations. That is, students were selected to insure the extension of ages beyond those ages which ECE students would attain by the end of the program as well as including those ages. The proportion of students in both ECE and kindergarten groups for which the information indicated no employment of parents was very similar, 23.7% for ECE and 21% for kindergarten.

Having selected the students, the remainder of the design called for measurement in the early fall, the development of regression predictions of post-test scores, the computation of the predicted post-test scores, measurement in May, and the comparison of predicted post-test scores with actual post-test scores. The data from kindergarten students in the fall would be the basis for the regression prediction of ECE student post-test scores, had they not been in the program.

b. Selection of Measures

Some of the issues involved in selection of instruments should be noted. General measures of student performance or of ability to perform are often used. These measures are attractive because they often are predictive of future school performance and because they are reliable, well-known measures and administration procedures are clear. Such measures include the Stanford-Binet Intelligence test, the Wechsler Preschool and Primary School Intelligence test, and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary test. However, these measures have limitations. They often do not relate closely to the specific objectives of a given program, they do not provide information on particular skills or abilities, and at least some of them are culturally biased. Program staff are understandably wary because of the tendency of some instructional personnel to use such measures to permanently categorize students.

An alternative approach is to obtain clearly-defined objectives, select measures as specific to those objectives as possible, and obtain information about growth toward those objectives. Such measures may have little predictive power. And, since the interest in early childhood education is relatively recent, there is seldom much information about typical student performance (normative data) or whether the measurement would turn out the same on two different occasions (reliability).

The ICS Evaluation Staff concluded that it would be more appropriate to the evaluation of this program — and more useful and acceptable to the Program Staff — to use measures which were more directly related to the objectives of the program. Among the measures identified, a number of those developed and/or selected by the Educational Testing Service for their longitudinal study of Head Start seemed appropriate. Others were selected from the battery of measures used by the Stanford

Research Institute in their study of Planned Variation in Head Start. One other measure, a rating of student classroom behavior by teachers, was selected as relevant to program objectives.

Nine measuring procedures were selected. One of these provided two scores, so the analysis of the impact of the Early Childhood Program on the students is based on ten scores. The following paragraphs in this section on instrument selection will provide a brief statement of the student performance(s) which each was selected to assess. A somewhat more complete statement regarding these measures is attached as Appendix G .

The Caldwell Preschool Inventory was initially developed by Bettye Caldwell and further refined by the Educational Testing Service. It samples student ability to respond to questions or directions in ways which reflect knowledge of body parts, colors, shapes, position, social function, and quantity, among other things. It provides a single score of essentially cognitive development.

The Maccoby Motor Inhibition Test was initially developed by Eleanor Maccoby. It has had further modification by the Educational Testing Service and by the Stanford Research Institute, both of which use the test in their evaluations of preschool programs. The student is requested to walk a six-foot board. Then he is asked to walk it again as slowly as possible. Following the procedure used (at that time) by the Stanford Research Institute, the slowest time is used as the measure.

A second part of that test has the student draw a horizontal line from one telephone pole to another (pictured on a page which has some lines already illustrated) using a ruler. The child is asked to draw a second line, this time as slowly as possible. The slowest time is taken as the score.

The Prepositions Inventory was developed by the staff of the Institute for Developmental Studies in New York. It assesses the student's knowledge of sixteen

prepositions. The student is presented with a page with four pictures for each preposition. Only one of the pictures on a page illustrates the preposition which is in the sentence read by the examiner. The student is to point to that picture.

The Children's Auditory Discrimination Inventory (CADI) was developed by Carolyn Stern of UCLA. It assesses the ability of the student to discriminate sounds. The instrument is designed to minimize the influence of general linguistic skills and vocabulary. The student is presented with a card which has two illustrations; one is of a real object, and the other is a nonsense line drawing. The examiner names each illustration, using the proper word for the real object and a nonsense word for the nonsense line drawing. Then the examiner repeats one of the words and requests the student to point to the proper picture.

The Brown Self Concept Referents Test was developed by B. R. Brown while on the staff of the Institute for Developmental Studies. It obtains information about the student's views of himself. A Polaroid picture is taken of the student. The examiner then asks the student whether the pictured child (the student himself) is one or the other of a pair of adjectives. Fifteen adjective pairs were presented, including such sets as happy - sad, clean - dirty, and smart - stupid.

The Numeral Names Inventory was developed by staff of the Institute for Developmental Studies. It assesses the ability of the student to correctly name single numerals. The assessment has two parts, one which requires the student to point to a named numeral of four presented. The second asks the child to name the single numeral presented.

The Alphabet Name Inventory, also a product of the Institute for Developmental Studies, assesses knowledge of capital letters. The procedure is similar to that used with numerals. It should be noted that this does not measure knowledge of letter sounds.

The TAMA General Knowledge Test was developed by the Educational Testing Service. The student is asked to respond to a series of questions which reflect knowledge of various things in American life. He is presented with three illustrations and selects the one that portrays the answer to the question. Some examples are: Which letter is ready to mail? Which person is oldest? What scared Goldilocks? Which one is Silver?

The last measure was the California Preschool Social Competency Scale. It was developed by Samuel Levine, Freeman Elroy, and Mary Lewis.
It is marketed by Consulting Psychologist Press, Inc.
This measure is not administered to students but is a rating of the student's classroom behavior. It requires someone who has observed the student rather extensively (which usually means the teacher) to rate such things as the frequency, extent, or complexity of behavior relevant to the learning situation, especially interaction with others. Among the behaviors rated are: greeting a new child, borrowing, sharing, and accepting limits.

c. Data Collection

Twenty data collectors were recruited and trained to administer the instruments. Organized into five teams of four, they first collected data from kindergarten students. These instruments were administered:

The Caldwell Preschool Inventory (Caldwell)
The Maccoby Motor Inhibition Test (Walking, Drawing)
The IDS Preposition Inventory (Prepositions)
The Children's Auditory Discrimination Inventory (CADI)
The Brown IDS Self Concept Referents Test (Self-Concept)

The kindergarten students were tested at the end of September, after approximately three weeks of school. (Thus, although they were selected for having had no preschool experience, by the time of testing, they had had some kindergarten. The effect of this experience should be to raise their scores. This should raise the post-test predictions for the ECE students which makes the test of the impact of the ECE program more stringent.)

When the testing was essentially completed for the kindergarten students, assessment of the ECE students began. By that time, the students had had about two weeks of school.

One measurement concern with young children who have had little or no experience with assessment is that gain from one testing to the second may be, in unknown amount, simply the effect of learning about test-taking from being assessed. The Program Staff discussed the problem with the Evaluation Staff to consider ways the students might have some experiences prior to assessment which would be like the assessment. To provide this experience, the Evaluation Staff prepared sample items which the teachers could ask children on an individual basis in the classroom. These items were similar in format to the assessment instrument items and required the same type of student response, but were not directly related to the areas measured by the instruments. These sample items were sent to all preschool and kindergarten teachers two weeks before testing began. Such experience should reduce the effects of learning to take tests on the main measurement. The Program Staff considered the testing procedures and concluded that many of the program activities were similar to the tasks required of the students by the tests. An additional element should reduce the impact on student responses in the testing situation, of simply being in the school situation. A sizable fraction of the ECE students (though less than half) participated

in a six-week summer program. Their scores would obviously have an impact on average scores. It is believed, therefore, that this measurement concern should be minimal.

The eight measurement procedures were administered to the students during the first half of October. Teachers completed their ratings on the Social Competency Scale at the end of October.

The post-test data were collected in May from those students who had been measured in the fall who were still in the program. Some data were obtained regarding 121 students, although for some, only Social Competency ratings by teachers were obtained. Sufficient data were available for a number of analyses on 112 students. Data were complete for 101 students.

Mean scores for 101 students for the October data collection and for the May data collection on all ten measures are presented in Table 2-1. That table also provides data on the regression predictions which were based on October data from the ECE students and the kindergarten students on six of the measures.

d. Data Analysis and Results

(1) Analysis Procedures. With the fall data on the first six variables, age, employment status of parents, and sex, the regression analyses were run. These analyses indicated that sex and employment status were not contributing to the regression equation in a significant way. However, Self-concept scores were correlated with scores on the Caldwell, Preposition Inventory, and Children's Auditory Discrimination Inventory. Therefore, two sets of predicted post-test scores were computed for those three measures, one based on Age alone, the other based on Age and Self-concept. Predicted post-test scores for the other three variables (Maccoby Motor Inhibition — Walking, Maccoby — Drawing, and Self-concept) were based on Age alone.

The basic issues of whether students gained and whether they gained more than would have occurred by maturation alone were confronted through four basic tests. The first and second tests (which were the most powerful) assessed whether differences between actual post-test scores and predicted post-test scores on the first six measures were greater than could be attributed to maturation alone. The third test assessed whether September to May score gains on the last four measures were greater than chance. The fourth test assessed whether September to May score gains on all ten measures were greater than chance.

Difference scores (post-test minus predicted post-test scores) were computed for each student using Age only as the predictor variable on the first six measures. Difference scores were computed for each student using Age plus Self-concept as predictors for the Caldwell, Prepositions, and Children's Auditory Discrimination Inventory measures. Thus, two tests were based on the difference scores:

(a) The difference between actual post-test scores and Age Only predicted post-test scores on six measures, the Caldwell, Walking, Drawing, Prepositions, CADI, and Self-concept.

(b) The difference between actual post-test scores and Age Only predicted post-test scores on three measures (Walking, Drawing, and Self-concept) together with Age plus Self-concept predicted post-test scores on three measures (Caldwell, Prepositions, and CADI).

Gain scores were computed for all ten measures by subtracting pretest scores from post-test scores for each student.

For each of the four tests, Hotelling's T^2 was computed for the mean difference or gain scores, and F ratios were obtained.[1] Basically, this procedure tests whether

---

[1] For a description of this procedure, see Chapter 4 of Morrison, Donald F. Multivariate Statistical Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

the combined changes on the measures being considered produce a significant difference.

(2) Results

(a) The F ratio for the differences between actual post-test scores and Age-only predicted post-test scores for the Caldwell, Maccoby-Walking, Maccoby - Drawing, Prepositions, CADI, and Self-concept, all considered at once, was clearly significant (see Table 2-2). The students gained more than would have been predicted by maturation alone.

(b) The F ratio for differences between actual post-test scores and Age-only predicted scores for the Maccoby - Walking, Maccoby - Drawing, and Self-concept and the Age plus Self-concept predicted scores for the Caldwell, Prepositions, and CADI was also clearly significant (see Table 2-2). The students gained more than would have been predicted by Age alone or Age plus initial Self-concept.

(c) The F ratio for gain scores (post-test scores minus pre-test scores) on the Numeral Names, Alphabet Names, TAMA (general knowledge), and Social Competency (rating) combined was clearly significant (see Table 2-2). Students gained more than would have occurred by chance.

(d) The F ratio for gain scores on all 10 measures combined was clearly significant (see Table 2-2). Students gained more than would have occurred by chance.

To summarize the results, analysis of the difference scores indicates that the program had a significant impact on student performance on tests related to abilities students need for success in school.

Table 2-1

October and May Mean Scores and Mean Gain Scores on Ten Measures and Predicted May Scores on Six Measures
(N = 101 students)

Measure	October Mean Score	Predicted May Mean Score: Age Only	Predicted May Mean Score: Age + Self-concept	May Mean Score
Caldwell	34.01	37.88	37.65	48.58
Maccoby-walking	60.87	72.59		88.57
Maccoby-drawing	75.24	100.70		119.54
Prepositions	7.87	9.11	9.05	11.28
CADI	30.45	31.66	31.55	33.76
Self-concept	11.74	11.91		13.46
Numeral	7.68			17.08
Alphabet	9.15			20.28
TAMA	13.21			16.85
Social Competency	81.60			94.40

Table 2-2

T^2 and F Ratios for Four Tests of Student Growth

Assessment of Change	N	T^2	df	F Ratio
Actual May scores less Age only predicted May scores on six measures[a]	112	281.19	6,106	44.71*
Actual May scores less Age only predicted May scores on three measures and Age plus Self-concept predicted May scores on three measures[b]	112	356.94	6,106	56.75*
Actual May scores less October scores on four measures[c]	104	289.19	4,100	70.19*
Actual May scores less October scores on ten measures	101	810.83	10,91	73.79*

[a]Caldwell, Maccoby-walking, Maccoby-drawing, Prepositions, Auditory Discrimination, Self-concept.

[b]Age only predictions for Maccoby-walking, Maccoby-drawing, and Self-concept, Age and Self-concept.

[c]Numeral Names, Alphabet Names, TAMA, Social Competency.

*Significant beyond the .05 level.

Question 3

Do These Programs Meet the Emotional, Social, Physical, and Intellectual Needs of Four-year-old Children Living in the Model Cities Neighborhoods?

As stated in previous documents, it is not within the scope of this evaluation to determine the emotional, social, physical and intellectual needs of four-year-old children living in the Model Cities neighborhoods.

In Questions 1 and 2 we discussed the objectives and the attainment of these objectives by participating children. It was concluded there that the program operates as defined, with some variation between classes, and that the participating children did grow toward the stated objectives. It can be concluded here that a program was offered which helped meet the basic needs of the children.

Question 4

Does Student Growth Toward the Specified Objectives Occur as Anticipated by the Program Staff?

a. What Growth is Made Toward Interim Objectives in the Areas of Cognitive, Affective, Social, and Psychomotor Development?

The overall objectives for the ECE Program defined the areas in which growth was anticipated. Three areas were designated in the Basic program classes — cognitive, affective, and psychomotor — and four in the Montessori classes — motor activity, sensory experiences with materials for development, exercises for development of language, and exercises in sensory geometry and number. Interim objectives which cited specific student behaviors required to attain the objectives in each area were then defined and listed sequentially within each area. These interim objectives were assigned at eight-week intervals and translated to checklist form to provide teachers with an instructional guide and a pupil evaluation tool (see Appendix C). At eight-week intervals, the teachers received a checklist reflecting increasingly more difficult behaviors. They were expected to provide instructional activities designed to attain those interim objectives. At the end of each period, teachers were to indicate the objectives attained by each pupil and return the checklist for processing. The checklist was then returned to the teacher. All teachers in the regular ECE Program used three checklists during the year. The Montessori teacher completed two.

At eight-week intervals, coinciding approximately with the teachers' collection of data and the collection of PROSE observation data, we had intended to measure the performance of a sample of students on the interim objectives. This was to be done in the same manner as the pretesting. Individual children would be taken from the classroom, tested, and returned. By the end of the first eight weeks, there were

numerous activities in the preschool classes which required the testing or examination of children: Institute for Pupil Studies, Health and Dental examination programs which involved all children, as well as other assessment activities which involved only a portion of the population. It was decided at that time that the interruptions to the program were excessive. Also, an additional testing of sample children on the interim objectives (which were directly related to the program objectives and similar to the items on the post-test instruments) might tend to contaminate the post-test results.

Therefore, it was decided to collect performance data at the same time the PROSE observation data were collected. The observers devoted part of their observation time to recording specific pupil behaviors related to the interim checklist objectives. This data collection did not provide useful information. At the eight-week collection period, the observers tended to report pupil and group behavior related to the PROSE instrument. At the sixteen-week collection period, there was more concentration on pupil performance data; however, only a small percentage of the objective areas were covered while observers were in the room. The observers were also limited by their inability to specify which children could or could not perform.

This left the checklists which had been completed by the classroom teacher as the primary source of information for determining whether progress was made as anticipated by the program staff. Those behaviors which they selected as highest priority and the placement of the interim objectives to a large degree determined the program offered in the classrooms.

Before discussing the results of the checklists, it is necessary to consider some of the limitations of the data. Each checklist was completed by a different teacher and under a wide range of measurement conditions. It is apparent that some teachers consistently rated their classes high or low. Some did not rate all children on all items

because of absences or other non-specified reasons. Some teachers did not assess an objective if it had not been included in the instructional activities, others did. For these, and other reasons, little comparison can be made between classes. They do, however, provide some interesting information across classes or across time.

Basic Program Checklist. As stated above, the interim objectives were arranged sequentially. An objective was repeated or rephrased when it was not attained at the 70 percent level by the total group. A total of 30 objectives were repeated once and nine twice. Ten additional objectives are rephrased a second or third time. Appendix C presents the three checklists in sequential order and the percentages of attainment in the eight sample classes. In all instances, repeated objectives were attained at a higher level by the total group the second or third time. There were four exceptions to this in the data for the sample classes. They were:

1. Reproduces an animal sound — duck (69 percent — 60 percent).
2. In an array, points to red (75 percent - 72 percent).
3. Distinguishes between big and little (81 percent - 77 percent).
4. Points to shoulder (87 percent - 86 percent).

The three areas listed in the overall objectives in which growth was anticipated (cognitive, social, and psychomotor) were expanded to six categories on the checklists:

1. Language - Listening
2. Language - Verbal
3. Language - Visual
4. Concepts
5. Synthesizing Behavior
6. Psychomotor

Language - Visual and Synthesizing did not appear on the first checklist because of the difficulty level of the specific behaviors.

For the eight sample classes in the Basic program, the level of attainment for all items on each checklist equalled or exceeded 70 percent (Table 4-1). However, one area on the first checklist, Language - Verbal, two on the second, Language - Verbal and Concepts, and one on the third, Language - Visual, were not attained at the 70 percent level.

Across the three checklists, the level of attainment for all items exceeded the 70 percent level; however, Language - Visual and Concepts were below that level for the sample classes.

Montessori Program Checklist. As with the Basic program, the Montessori objectives were arranged sequentially. A total of 79 items were repeated on the second checklist. Six were rated 100 percent both times, five were not rated either time, and nine were not rated the first time. Of the remaining 59, the percentage of attainment on the second checklist was higher on 54 items and lower on five (Appendix D). These five were:

1. Can help break simple words into component sound verbally (76 percent - 47 percent).
2. Can pick work spontaneously rather than adult imposed 50 percent of class time (100 percent - 97 percent).
3. Is occupied with work during class time 75 percent of the time (97 percent - 87 percent).
4. Is able to focus complete attention on teacher's demonstration (59 percent - 33 percent).
5. Is precise in following procedure in activity 50 percent of the time (59 percent - 30 percent).

The four areas listed in the overall objectives — Motor Activities, Sensory Experiences with Materials for Development, Exercises for Development of Language, and Exercises in Sensory Geometry — were placed in five categories on the checklist:

1. Language
2. Psychomotor
3. Concept
4. Self-Concept
5. Character Development

For the two classes, the average percentage of attainment for all items exceeds the 70 percent level on each checklist and the checklists combined (Table 4-2). In all categories, but Concept, the average percentage of attainment exceeds the 70 percent level. In all categories, except Psychomotor, the average percentage of attainment increases from the first to the second assessment.

Discussion. Data from both types of checklists, Basic and Montessori, indicate that student growth did occur in the direction anticipated. The lack of exceptionally high or low percentages within any objective area indicates a consistency between objective difficulty. The inclusion of specific objectives for each area indicates a range in instructional activities.

b. Is Growth Toward Interim Objectives Predictive of Growth Toward Terminal Program Objectives?

The data collected on the checklists, discussed above, indicate that the preschool children as a group did make progress toward the interim objectives. Pre and post-tests were administered to the sample group to determine their attainment of the terminal objectives (see discussion of Question 2). As a group, the preschool children did show progress on those instruments. The checklist data are, therefore, verified by the test data for the total group.

Several attempts were made to determine whether the checklist data are predictive for individual classes or children. To determine whether teachers were consistent in their assessment of children within their own classes, the correlation between

the rank order of children on checklist one and two, two and three and one and three, was computed (see Table 4-3). The correlations between the teacher's ranking of children were positive in all cases but two. They were not high enough or consistent enough to support comparisons between classes. Only eight of the 26 were significant at the .01 level.

Part of the difficulty in consistent ranking of children on successive checklists could be attributed to differences in gains made by different children. The potential for growth is greater for children entering at the lower attainment levels. Of the pre-post instrument, the Caldwell Preschool Inventory measures the widest range of objectives which are included on the checklists. Therefore, the scores on this instrument were selected as the best descriptor of initial and terminal state.

Two sets of correlation coefficients were computed. First, the correlation between the pretest score on the Caldwell and the percentage of attainments on the first checklist were computed. Then the correlation between the Caldwell post-test score and percentage of attainment on the third and last checklist were computed (see Table 4-4). Once again, the correlations were generally positive with only two exceptions on the correlation between pre Caldwell and first checklist. Only seven of the 20 correlations were significant at the .01 level.

In summary, the checklists did predict growth for the total group, but were not sufficiently stable to use as predictors of success for individual classes or children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4-1

Student Attainment in Objective Areas - Basic Program
Teacher Assessment on Interim Checklists
Sample Classes Only

OBJECTIVE AREA	FIRST OBSERVATION N = 148	SECOND OBSERVATION N = 141	THIRD OBSERVATION N = 148	1,2 & 3RD TOTAL N = 437
Language - Listening	92	79	70	80
Language - Verbal	64	68	83	71
Language - Visual	--	71	63	67
Concepts	75	64	71	69
Senthesizing	--	89	84	86
Self-Concept	82	75	71	76
Psychomotor	80	84	81	81
TOTAL	78	70	72	73

TABLE 4-2

Student Attainment in Objective Areas - Montessori Program
Teacher Assessment on Interim Checklists
Sample Classes Only

	1ST CHECKLIST N = 29	2ND CHECKLIST N =30	TOTAL N = 59
Language	77%	78%	77%
Psychomotor	79%	90%	84%
Concept	55%	80%	68%
Self-Concept	91%	99%	95%
Character-Development	75%	85%	79%
TOTAL	74%	83%	78%

TABLE 4-3

Reliability of Interim Checklist Data
Correlation Between Checklist Ranking

CLASS	1ST - 2ND	2ND - 3RD	1ST - 3RD
0	.92 *	.90 *	.74
1	-.86	.39	.56
2	.19	.80 *	.01
3	70	-11	97 *
4	.64	.52	.57
5	.50	.44	.24
6	.62 *	---	---
7	.75 *	---	---
8	.73 *	.37	.36
9	.64	.80 *	.65

* Sig. 01

TABLE 4-4

Correlation Between Caldwell Scores and Checklist Data

CLASS	N	PRE-CALDWELL/1ST CHECKLIST	POST-CALDWELL/3RD CHECKLIST
0	8	.50	.51
1	11	.82*	.36
2	13	.16	.58
3	7	.27	.37
4	7	.36	.93*
5	12	-.05	.71*
6	16	.70*	.55
7	11	.80*	.42
8	15	.75*	.40
9	10	-.04	.76*

* Sig. 01

Question 5

Do Children Who Participate in Different Early Childhood Education Programs Grow Differentially?

The fact of student growth was established in the section above under Question 2. Attention is now turned to whether there may have been differential growth in different programs. It should be recalled that, for the purposes of this study, each class which received intensive study was considered a separate program. Thus, there were ten programs to consider.

The data involved in the present analysis are obtained from the analyses above in answer to Question 2. Both "Difference" scores and "Gain" scores are used. Difference scores were computed by obtaining actual May test scores (based on student responses to measurement procedures) and Age only predicted May test scores (based on the regression analysis of ECE and Kindergarten student responses in October). Predicted scores were subtracted from actual scores to obtain Difference scores. They reflect the amount of increase students achieved beyond that predicted from maturation alone.

Gain scores were computed by subtracting October test scores from May test scores. Difference and gain scores are presented in Table 5-1.

In considering the analysis of differences among classes on Difference scores or Gain scores, it is important to compare those scores with the pretest scores. If the classes which had the lowest average score in October also were the ones which increased the most, then the difference among classes may be principally a matter of having more room to grow. (This is sometimes called the "ceiling" effect.) To test this, Spearman Rank-Difference correlations were computed between October scores and Difference or Gain scores.[1] Across the ten measures, the correlations varied

[1] H. M. Blalock, Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960, p. 317.

Table 5-1

Average Difference and Gain Scores on Ten Measures
(Total N = 101)

Class	Difference Scores (May Test Scores less Age Only Predicted May Test Scores)						Gain Scores (May Test Scores less October Test Scores)			
	Caldwell	Walking	Drawing	Prepositions	Auditory Discrimination	Self Concept	Numeral Names	Alphabet Names	TAMA	Social Competency
M	14.14	-1.98	4.66	3.49	5.09	2.00	17.67	24.00	3.83	15.00
N	13.25	21.81	22.37	2.36	3.00	2.16	8.18	8.09	3.18	4.36
O	9.76	10.58	7.17	1.61	1.08	1.95	10.67	23.58	6.33	31.17
P	9.60	14.55	-4.65	1.74	1.03	0.50	9.73	10.91	2.18	5.09
Q	8.78	3.07	-13.93	1.70	1.72	1.07	9.78	9.56	4.11	12.11
R	8.18	25.58	24.96	2.05	0.32	2.42	8.50	7.20	4.00	20.60
S	13.49	17.63	92.49	3.94	4.43	2.73	14.33	13.50	5.33	17.83
T	11.04	30.01	17.59	1.77	2.13	1.11	7.79	8.57	3.71	3.64
U	13.12	-1.90	53.59	3.37	3.27	0.02	8.71	3.86	2.57	6.57
V	9.23	20.19	-3.12	1.65	1.77	1.63	5.93	6.80	2.07	13.67

80

markedly, ranging from .71 to -.52. Seven appeared to be positive. Two were significant, and both were positive. Thus, it appears that there was not greater increase among classes with low pretest scores, which would have been indicated by significant negative correlations.

Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores

The analyses of variance conducted for the first six measures (Caldwell, Walking, Drawing, Prepositions, CADI, and Self-concept) were done on Difference scores. (The detailed discussion of the procedure for obtaining these scores is in the section above under Question 2.) The results of these analyses are presented in Table 5-2. In this table (and the next) the Variance Source column refers to the variance between the 10 classes (which reflects differences between classes) and the variance within the 10 classes (which reflects differences among students).

As indicated there, a significant difference in gain among the classes was found for the Self-concept measure only. Since differences exist among the classes on the Self-concept measure, a limited number of t tests were performed, following a modification of the Tukey[2] procedure. The mean Difference scores on Self-concept were examined for apparent groupings.

It appeared that Classes S and R might be similar and have large Difference scores, that Classes T and Q might be similar with relatively low Difference scores, and that Classes P and U might be similar and have low scores. t tests were performed and the members of each pair were found to be not significantly different from each other. The pairs were then combined.

---

[2]See J. W. Tukey, Comparing individual means in the analysis of variance. Biometrics, 1949, 5, 99-114.

Table 5-2

Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Scores on Six Measures

Measure[a]	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F Ratio
Caldwell	Between	385.07	9	43.78	.81
	Within	4,813.84	91	53.90	
Walking	Between	10,031.22	9	1,114.58	.44
	Within	229,467.50	91	2,521.62	
Drawing	Between	66,195.56	9	7,355.06	.81
	Within	830,814.50	91	9,129.83	
Preposition	Between	55.77	9	6.20	.77
	Within	728.73	91	8.01	
CADI	Between	164.45	9	18.27	1.36
	Within	1,226.85	91	13.48	
Self-concept	Between	56.33	9	6.26	2.64*
	Within	216.04	91	2.37	

[a]Data for this analysis are May test scores less Age only predicted May test scores.

*Significant at the .05 level or better.

Classes S + R were compared with Classes T + Q, and a significant Difference was found. Classes S + R were compared with Classes P + U, and a significant difference was found. Thus, Classes S + R had higher Difference scores than the other two pairs. There was not a significant difference between Classes T + Q and P + U.

Classes T + Q were compared with Class N, which had the third highest mean Difference score. There was not a significant difference.

Analysis of Variance on Gain Scores

The analyses of variance on the last four measures (Numeral Names, Alphabet Names, TAMA, and Social Competency) were done on Gain scores. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 5-3. Significant differences among classes were found on Alphabet Names and Social Competency (ratings by teachers).

Again, mean Gain scores were examined for possible groupings. Class M was found to be not significantly different from Class O, and they were combined. Classes M+O were found to have a significantly higher Gain score than Class S, which appeared to have the third largest Gain score. Class S was not significantly different from Class P which appeared to have the next largest Gain score. Class S was significantly different from Class V, which had the second lowest Gain score. Class V was not significantly different from Class U, which had the lowest Gain score, nor was it different from Class R, which had the third lowest Gain score and was just above Class V.

Thus, Classes M + O gained more than Class S, and Class S gained more than Class V. However, Class V is not different from the next class lower in Gain score (Class U) nor from the next class higher in Gain score (Class R). It appears that groupings between Class S and Class U are not likely.

Table 5-3

Analysis of Variance of Mean Gu[illegible][a] Scores on Four Measures

Measure	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F Ratio
Numeral	Between	822.23	9	91.36	
	Within	5,785.91	91	63.58	1.44
Alphabet	Between	3,910.58	9	434.51	
	Within	11,786.72	91	129.52	3.35*
TAMA	Between	178.67	9	19.85	
	Within	1,020.50	91	11.21	1.77
Social Competency	Between	7,735.11	9	859.46	
	Within	12,465.48	91	136.98	6.27*

[a]Data for this analysis are May scores less October scores.

*Significant at the .05 level or better.

Thus, the clearest finding from these t tests following the F test on differences in Gain on the Alphabet Names test is that Classes M + O gained more than Class S, which appeared to have the third highest gain. However, Class S is not different from the class with the next highest gain (ClassP). Arbitrary selections of classes to compare, rather than comparisons based on statistically differentiated groupings, is not in accordance with Tukey's procedure and was done to provide indications of possible differences in growth which might be associated with particular classroom activities. The analysis searching for such an association is the topic for the next question.

Similar procedures were used on the Social Competency ratings. It is well to remember that these ratings are done by the classroom teachers, the only ones with adequate familiarity with students to make the ratings. It is possible that unintended systematic bias on the part of teachers may influence these results. They should be considered with that reservation. One class had a change in teachers between ratings. This class is not involved in this analysis.

Class O had a significantly higher mean Gain score than Class R, which apparently had the second highest gain. Class R was not significantly different from Class S, which apparently had the third highest Gain score. Classes P, N, and T were found to be not significantly different and were combined. Class R had a significantly higher Gain score than Classes P + N + T combined.

Thus, Class O gained more than the other classes, and Class R gained more than Classes P + N + T combined. Other differences are less clear.

Summary of Differences Among Classes

Differences among classes were found on three measures, Self-concept (which was based on Difference scores), Alphabet Names (based on Gain scores), and Social Competency (based on Gain scores on teacher ratings). Three of the classes appeared

among the top two or three classes in gains (or differences) on two measures, and three classes appeared among the lowest in gains (or differences) on two measures. However, since the measures would seem to fit in different learning objective domains, it is difficult to identify any patterns.

Question 6

What Differences Among Programs May Account for Differences in Student Growth?

The objective of this question was to seek relationships among the characteristics of different programs and differential growth. The bases for working on this question are in the results presented under Question 1 and Question 5 above.

The approach taken was to array classes according to their Gain scores on each instrument and according to the percent of codings received on various categories (or combinations) on the PROSE observations. By inspection, it was determined that no patterns could be identified between the two sets of data. That is, gain (on one of the three measures for which significant differences among classes had been found in the analysis of Question 5 above) did not seem to be related to being high or low on the PROSE categories. There is a slight hint that classes which were observed to spend less time in sensory learning activities may have gained more on the Alphabet Names measure. It would be useful to pursue this in the future.

In summary, differences among programs on PROSE data do not appear to be related to differences in student growth on the measures used in this study.

Question 7

Do Parents Who Participate in the Parent Educational Component Change Their Behavior and Attitude Relevant to Their Children's Development

The question as stated here was only tentatively analyzed by the evaluation. The necessary expenditure of time required for instrument development, to assess changes in parent behavior and attitude as well as measure interim student development, was considered prohibitive by ICS and MCA staff. Additionally, the developmental state of intended program objectives and activities of both the ECE instructional program and the Parent Participation component made the development of adequate measures impossible.

An attempt was made to assess parental attitudes and behaviors at the time the children entered preschool. This was done through the Parent Interview Questionnaire which was completed by most parents at the time of enrollment. Parents of new children who were not interviewed at that time were interviewed by the child's teacher during the first month of the program (see Appendix H).

During the year records were maintained by the ECE Parent Participation Coordinator on the number and type of activities in which parents participated. An attempt was made to correlate the degree to which parents were actively involved in parent participation activities with the gains the children made toward program objectives as measured by the pre-post-test instruments.

The teachers were requested to indicate their perception of the degree to which the parents of sample children were involved with the program. This was done to provide a measure of involvement which was not based on the formal attendance of parent participation meetings but on parental interest demonstrated to teachers. Five teachers provided this information the week of May 24.

An additional factor was considered. The child's attendance at school was interpreted as an indicator of the degree to which the parents see the program as important. The four-year-old child is almost completely dependent on the parent to get to school. Therefore, an attempt was made to correlate pupil attendance and the gains made toward program objectives as measured by the pre- post-test instrumen's.

Finally, a questionnaire was developed at the end of the year to assess parental attitudes toward the ECE Program and the Parent Participation component. It was sent to the parents of sample children in 5 of the ECE classes on May 21. (The other 5 classes could not be included because the program terminated on May 21.) A total of 50 questionnaires was distributed. Thirty-six, or 72%, were returned.

Parent Interview Questionnaire

Usable data were reported on 110 of the 149 Parent Interview Questionnaires (74%). Questionnaires were not available from parents whose children had participated in the summer program (another form was used at that time) and responses could not be obtained from some parents. Specific areas of the questionnaire are seen as pertinent to this evaluation (reported in Table 7-1). These are:

1. The parents' reason for enrolling the child.
2. The parents' expectations of what the program will do.
3. The parents' perceptions of effective child-rearing practices.
4. The parents' identification of problem behaviors.

Most parents cited more than one reason for enrolling their child in ECE. In all cases, at least one of the reasons cited related to gains they hoped the children would make, as opposed to advantages it might offer the parent (babysitting, etc.). Two reasons, "To help the child grow socially," and "To help the child grow academically" were cited by over half the parents interviewed, 51 and 52 percent respectively.

Table 7-1

Responses of Parents in Parent Interview Questionnaire at Beginning of the 1970-71 ECE Program

Response Categories	% of 110 Responses
Parent's reason for enrolling child in ECE	
Previous experience with a child in Head Start	15%
To help child grow socially	51
To help child grow academically	52
For helping out economically	10
Parent's expectations of what the program will do	
Help child grow academically	63
Provide child with health services	12
Help child grow socially	63
Provide food	13
Other	7
Parent's perceptions of child-rearing practices (to make child do something)	
Bribe him	27
Yell at him	36
Ask him (reason)	20
Threaten him	12
Tell him	36
Hit him	12
Other	8
Parent's identification of problem behaviors	
Sucks thumb	17
Bites nails	15
Wets the bed	25
Cries at night	12
Other	2

When the parents were asked what they thought the program would accomplish, even a higher percentage selected the academic (63%) and social (63%) gain areas.

A wide range of parent practices in child control were expressed on the questionnaire. Yelling and telling were rated highest (36%), with bribing (27%) next. There is no way to determine to what degree the responses were influenced by what the parents thought would be approved of by the interviewer. If they view school personnel and procedures as placing an emphasis on developing "reasoned" behavioral control, the percentage under "Ask Him" would be disproportionately high. If they view the school as a more coercive environment, the other categories would likely be distorted upward.

Relatively high percentages were reported in the area of problem behaviors. Very few children were reported as having more than one of the problem behaviors. Bed wetting was the most common (25%), followed by thumb sucking (17%) and nail biting (15%).

The Parent Interview Questionnaires were seen as useful in providing the teachers with a better understanding of the parent's views of their own children. They also helped the parents to understand that the school had a wide range interest in their children.

Parent Participation and Pupil Gain

The attendance rosters of all parent participation meetings in the Model Cities program were examined to locate parents of sample children. Parents were defined as "participating" if they had attended one or more meetings. The number of meetings attended ranged from 1 to 8. There were 36 sample children whose parents were designated as "participating."

To determine whether there is a relationship between parent attendance at parent participation meetings and pupil gain the correlation between attendance and pupil gain on 10 instruments was computed (see Table 7-2). In all cases the correlations are low and 3 of the 10 are negative.

Table 7-2

Correlations Between Parent Participation and Gain Scores on Ten Measures for 61 Students

Measures	Correlation with Parent Participation
Caldwell	.15
Walking	-.10
Drawing	.08
Prepositions	.04
CADI	.07
Self Concept	.11
Numeral	-.10
Alphabet	-.02
TAMA	.18
Social Competency	.17

Pupil Attendance and Pupil Gain

Data on pupil attendance were obtained from the class rosters which are maintained by the classroom teacher. Data on pupil attendance and gains scores on 10 measures were available for 104 sample children. The correlation between the two was computed and these figures are reported in Table 7-3. Once again the correlations were low. One, the correlation between attendance and gain on Alphabet Naming, was significant at the .05 level. Of the others, 2 were negative and 1 was .00.

Table 7-3

Correlations Between Attendance Data and Gain Scores on Ten Measures for 104 Students

Measure	Correlation with Attendance
Caldwell	.03
Walking	.02
Drawing	.05
Prepositions	-.07
CADI	.06
Self Concept	-.01
Numeral	.11
Alphabet	.26*
TAMA	.00
Social Competency	.05

*Significant at the .05 level.

Teacher's Perceptions of Parent Involvement

To provide a measure of the teacher's perceptions of the level of parent involvement, five teachers of sample classrooms were requested to complete a form identifying the participation level of the parent of each sample child in her class. Five levels of involvement were included ranging from 1 to 5. A space was provided for the teachers to identify all parents who had attended Open House and to write any comments they felt were needed to explain their entries.

Teachers of sample children generally saw the parents as wanting to be involved (Table 7-4). When they perceived a parent as non-involved, they felt it necessary to explain. The following are samples of teacher comments in those instances:

> I visited parents in their home but while they were very cooperative I never saw or talked to her again.
>
> Parents work — were not involved — if I call they appear to be cooperative.

Her daughter became ill and it was very difficult to reach the mother — don't seem involved.

Mother seems interested but has very little time to attend school events.

Aunt takes care of the child during the day — she is involved but not the mother.

I had one home visit with the parents — they both work and sometimes find it hard to get their child to school.

Teachers seem to see a greater percentage of the parents as involved with the program. Their comments indicate that in many instances the lack of participation is not the result of non-interest or support but other pressures.

Table 7-4

Sample Classroom Teacher's Perception of Parent Participation in Their Child's School Experience

Involvement Level		% of 70 Responses
5	Very involved	41
4		17
3		17
2		7
1	Not involved	18

End of Year Questionnaire

The end of the year questionnaire which was returned by the parents of 36 sample children, indicated that three-fourths of them had attended parent meetings (see Table 7-5). Eighty-four percent felt the program should be continued. There were mixed responses on the best time for parent participation meetings and on meeting location. However, 43 percent preferred evening meetings and 74 percent preferred the preschool as the meeting site. There appeared to be overwhelming support of the preschool program with 93 percent indicating they would enroll other children in the program (if they had any).

Table 7-5

Parent Responses to Questionnaire Concerning Parent Involvement Component and the ECE Program

Question		% of 36 Responses
Did you attend any parent meetings?	Yes	75%
	No	25
How frequently did you attend?	Once	25%
	2-3 times	37
	4 or more	37
Would you like to see Parent Involvement program next year?	Yes	84%
	No	0
	No opinion	16
What is the best time for having meetings?	8 or 9 AM	11%
	Mid-morning	6
	Early afternoon	9
	Late afternoon	17
	In the evening	43
	It makes no difference	14
Where should meeting be held?	At preschool	74%
	In school buildings	3
	In neighborhood church	0
	Makes no difference	17
	Other places	6
Would you want another child in preschool?	Yes	93%
	Not certain	3
	No	0
	No response	4

Summary

As stated above, it was impossible from the data collected to determine whether parents who participate in the parent educational component change their behavior and attitude relevant to their children's development. It was possible to measure certain parent attitudes and behaviors. It appears that parents are highly supportive of the program and want it to produce academic and social growth in their children.

Parent participation records (for 5 classes) indicated that 72 percent of the parents of sample children attended parent participation meetings and 75 percent of the parents returning the end of year questionnaire indicated they had attended at least one meeting. The teachers, also, perceived a high percentage of parents as involved with the program.

Pupil gain and parent participation, as measured by attendance at parent education meetings, were not correlated. In only one instance was the correlation between pupil attendance and pupil gain significant -- Alphabet Naming.

Much more work needs to be done on assessing the relationship between parent involvement and pupil growth in the preschool. Perhaps with more definitive objectives for the instructional and the parent participation component this can be done.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question 8

Are These Programs Complementary with the Kindergarten Programs of the Urban Kansas City Schools?

Definition

What is complementarity? To obtain an adequate definition of complementarity at the preschool-kindergarten level, Dr. Arlene Payne, of the University of Missouri — Kansas City, was consulted. In collaboration with the ICS staff she developed the following:

> "Complementarity is a set of conditions which provides maximum opportunity for continuous development of the individual as he moves through consecutive organizational stages of education. As the student passes a point of juncture, progressing from one institutional setting to the next, his continuing development is not slowed by redundancy nor hampered by unrealistic expectations on the part of those responsible for his education. His development will continue smoothly in the same general directions. Thus there are two basic criteria by which the complementarity of two consecutive institutional settings may be judged:
>
> 1. There is congruence of expectations at the point of juncture. Those responsible for the individual's education prior to and subsequent to a juncture point agree on the expected levels of development at that point. This may include personal, social, cognitive, and physical development.
> 2. Learning is sequential across the point of juncture. Objectives and learning opportunities show continuity and sequence. Learning prior to the juncture point leads directly to greater learning following.
>
> "When these two criteria are met, it is assumed that the quality of complementarity exists. Conversely, where they are not met, there is some lack of this quality. These two criteria provide the principal basis for the study of complementarity.
>
> "The foregoing criteria pertain directly to the instructional program per se, both the planned and the actual educational objectives and activities. From a broader perspective, there are other factors that may interfere with sequential learning which should at least be recognized in a complete definition of complementarity. The student may experience many changes in the educational environment as he moves from one setting to another. He may, for example, move from a setting that is less competitive to one that is more competitive in peer relations. In many instances there is a change in classroom organization with a resulting difference in the amount and nature of teacher-student contact. Possibly the

change is a markedly different attitude on the part of teachers regarding such things as 'obedience.' Such changes in the environment are inevitable and they result from many causes — traditional views of what each organizational level should be like, administrative attitudes, and so on. The important point is that the planned program and specific activities may meet the criteria for complementarity listed above but the environmental hiatus could still have a disruptive effect on sequential learning. The problem is that we have insufficient evidence on whether or in what way such changes reduce sequential learning or whether they might in fact increase it."

Determination

Operating within the framework of Dr. Payne's definition the two programs were examined on the basis of data available. This necessitated a reliance on written material, consultation with the staff of each program and the classroom observation data gathered in the preschool classes.

It appeared unlikely that there could be great dissimilarity between the ECE Program and the Division of Urban Education Kindergarten Program. Both have been developed under the direction of the Division of Urban Education, since the funding of Head Start in 1964 and ESEA Title I in 1965. The educational aspect of both programs are operated by that division and many of the administrators, supervisors and teachers have had experience in both the preschool and the kindergarten programs. In addition, all three administrators of the ECE Program were on the original planning committee of the kindergarten curriculum and two of the three reading program administrators were involved in the development of the ECE curriculum.

1. Is there congruence of expectation at the point of juncture? To determine the congruence of expectations written descriptions of the "preschool" and the "kindergarten age" child were considered (Appendices I and J). Both programs state that the description is broad and general because there will be a wide range of maturity levels in each class. The preschool description stresses communication skills deficiencies and

emphasizes that these, as well as other characteristics, are a result of limited experiences. They do not enumerate the social or physical characteristics of the preschool child. Information about those characteristics had to be obtained from program activities.

The description of the kindergarten child is more extensive. It emphasizes emotional and social needs. It describes the child as more verbal and curious, but states that the children need continued experience and success.

There are obvious differences in these descriptions. They are not, however, descriptions of children at the point of juncture. They are broad descriptions of the age group. The preschool child is described as more immature in all common dimensions but fewer areas are included. If the suggestions for developing each area were successfully applied, then the preschool child at the end of the year would be more verbal and curious (as the kindergarten child is described). The lack of descriptive material in the physical, emotional and social dimensions makes comparison there difficult. A review of program activities, however, indicates that in those domains the children are viewed as less able than in the kindergarten age descriptions. Suggestions for the development of large and small muscles, establishment of adult/child rapport and development of contact with others; if attained, would place the preschool children at the kindergarten age description level.

This comparison of congruence has been based on written statements. What occurs in the classroom should also be considered. This was possible, to a degree, for the preschool program through an assessment of the PROSE data discussed earlier. No classroom data were collected in the kindergarten. The PROSE data indicate that the classroom offering is consistent with the description of the preschool child. In the language area there is greater verbalization by adults than children. The time spent on language instruction increases over time as the skill develops. Use of materials

also increases over the time period as muscles develop. Behavior is highly cooperative and convergent rather than divergent which would indicate a lack of curiosity. This is true on all PROSE data collections. Socially, the children are most frequently interacting with adults. This is followed in magnitude by working by themselves. Peer interaction is lowest. The amount of child-child interaction does not change much throughout the year. Finally, a great deal of time is spent on Free Play which would provide for developing through experience.

It can only be assumed that the implemented kindergarten program is as congruent with the pupil description. A review of the suggested activities indicates that, if they are implemented, the children participate in activities which are designed for the children as described.

In the description of classroom activities an emphasis is placed on providing children with opportunities to succeed by diversifying the instructional approach. Teachers are directed to recognize and support the children's efforts to learn. It is suggested that learning centers be established so groups of children can engage in different activities at the same time. And teachers are requested to think of all activities as an opportunity to increase the child's experimental base and expand his language facility.

From these data it is difficult to conclude that the expectation levels are congruent at the point of juncture, but they do have the potential for being so. In the written descriptions of the age groups and the format of instructional activities the preschool child is at a lower developmental level. The goal of the instructional activities is to direct his development toward that state which is described for the kindergarten child.

2. Is learning sequential across the point of juncture? Determining whether learning is sequential across the points of juncture is a somewhat easier task. The preschool program had specific objectives at eight week intervals as well as a final rating sheet for each child's attainment of objectives. The kindergarten program has designated Level 2 or 3 of their curriculum guide as the level at which they expect children with preschool experience to enter their program. At the end of the school year, a rating of each child was prepared for the child's kindergarten teacher.

A comparison was made of the items on the ECE rating sheet (Appendix K) and the Level I and II review tests (Appendices L and M). The preschool rating sheet was designed as a summation rather than an enumeration of specific skills. In those areas where the kindergarten skill was more specific, reference was made to the ECE interim objectives checklists. This comparison revealed that the preschool rating sheet or interim objective checklists contained all items in the Self-Image, Mental Readiness, and Language Readiness areas of the Level I review test. It only contained one item from the Social and Emotional Readiness area.

There was less congruency between the preschool rating scale or interim objectives checklists and the Level II review test. Fourteen of the 31 items are not included.

It is apparent, then, that the preschool program contains the objectives of Level I of the kindergarten curriculum and part of Level II. This indicates that the programs provide for sequential learning if the children are not entered into the kindergarten curriculum at Level I, where many would experience needless repetition, or at Level III, which is beyond the scope of the preschool curriculum.

3. What are the differences in educational environments? The educational environment in which the programs are offered must be considered at this point. There is great variability in the sites of the preschool classes. Over half the classes were located in preschool centers (21); the rest were housed in elementary schools but in most cases were somewhat separate from the regular functioning of the schools. Administration, instructional supervision and support activities were highly concentrated on the four-year-old in the ECE Program. The educational environment and the child's relationship to it changes when he enters kindergarten. The degree of change varies from school to school, but in all cases the organizational focus is shared with a wide range of age groups. This places the child in an environment where his contact with school personnel is reduced. The organization requires that he conform to an increased number of regulations and restrictions. In many cases the role of teacher and child is also altered. Competition between children within the classroom and between classes in the halls and cafeteria are common in some schools. If the children can enter the school "gradually" with the kindergarten children set apart — both geographically in the building and socially in the number of total school activities in which they participate, this transition to the elementary school can become a gradual adjustment to a higher level of organization. If he is expected to meet all the organizational requirements the first day, the transition difficulties could greatly disrupt sequential learning.

Conclusion

The comparability of expectation and objectives appears to be high. It must be remembered that there are differences between classes, but in general the preschool program and the kindergarten program should meet the basic requirements for continuous

development. The adverse effect of the changing environment can be mediated by preparation for charge at the preschool level by increasing conformity requirements during the year and a gradual introduction to the traditional routine when the child enters elementary school.

Question 9

What Are the Effects of the Staff Development Activities?

Staff development, both pre-service and in-service, is an integral part of the Early Childhood Education Program. During the 1970-71 school year, five days were spent on pre-service training and two days per month on in-service. Planning and presenting the sessions was the responsibility of a committee composed of all levels of administrative, instructional, and support personnel. A variety of activities were presented during the year, including presentations by outside experts, program personnel, and workshops.

The pre-service meeting in September and the first in-service meeting in the months of February, March, and May were selected for evaluation. The evaluation format varied. Following the February and March meetings, the teachers completed a questionnaire assessing their immediate reaction to the presentation. After a three-week interval, they completed a follow-up questionnaire assessing their impressions at that time as well as the degree to which they had applied information presented in the meeting. Administrative and supervisory personnel completed the first questionnaire and a follow-up questionnaire assessing the degree to which they had observed application in their own buildings. The May evaluation consisted of a single questionnaire presented at the end of the morning session. A three-week follow-up was impossible due to the early termination of the Head Start portion of the Program. A questionnaire assessing the pre-service session and staff development in general was also completed at the May in-service meeting.

The sessions selected for evaluation represented the range of activities presented this year. In all cases, they were total group sessions for at least part of the day.

1. Pre-Service Meeting, September 8-14, 1971

The pre-service meeting was held at St. Stephens Baptist Church. It was a combined enterprise including participants from all Head Start programs under the auspices of the Human Resources Corporation (Clay, Jackson, and Platte counties) as well as the Model Cities Early Childhood Education personnel. It was originally planned and organized by the Human Resources Corporation but last minute difficulties placed the major responsibility for the presentation and execution on the ECE staff.

Generally, the meetings were scheduled from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. with coffee and lunchbreaks. General Sessions and Large and Small Group Meetings were scheduled throughout the day. An attempt was made to vary the format, grouping of participants and content of the presentation to maximize interest and information gained. Attendance remained high throughout the five-day session.

Evaluation of Pre-Service Meeting. Questionnaires were distributed to 29 teachers and 8 other staff members (Appendix N). Twenty-eight questionnaires were returned, twenty-three from teachers and five other staff members. The first part of the questionnaire contained questions about the meetings held on September 8-14. On the first page, they were asked to indicate the usefulness of the meetings by category: General Sessions, Large Group Sessions, and Small Group Sessions. On the following pages, they were asked to rate the top three meetings in each category and comment on why they selected the ones they did. Seven respondents ranked all of the meetings rather than rating the top three. Three responding teachers did not complete this section because they had joined the staff after the pre-service meeting.

Respondents found the General Sessions least useful, although they felt General Sessions provided an opportunity for communicating the same information to everyone at the same time. Inability to hear and the length of the General Sessions

were the factors criticized. Large Group Sessions were rated slightly higher. Providing an opportunity to discuss common concerns was cited as their strength. Poor organization was the major criticism. Small Group Sessions were most favored. Respondents said they provided an opportunity to get to know people and to discuss "real" problems. However, the Small Group Sessions were heavily criticized for their poor organization.

All but two of the General Sessions received a ranking of 1, 2, or 3. Presentations by persons directly related to the daily operation of the program were selected most frequently. All the Large Group Sessions received a ranking of 1, 2, or 3. All these sessions dealt with the specific needs of children and the more specific presentations were preferred. All of the Small Group Sessions were rated 1, 2, or 3, also. Once again, those sessions which provided information directly related to the instruction of children were preferred over more General Sessions.

The second part of the questionnaire assessed the respondents' preference in grouping patterns and presentation format. Once again, all types of grouping patterns were rated 1, 2, or 3. Smaller groupings or interest-related groupings were most selected. Discussions and demonstrations were the most preferred presentation format.

Discussion. The questionnaires indicate that there is a wide range in attitudes toward the pre-service meeting. All types of grouping and all types of presentations were ranked 1, 2, or 3 by at least one respondent. The comments indicated that the respondents prefer sessions which provide concrete information in an organized manner. Also, they prefer sessions where they can participate in the activity or utilize the materials or techniques presented at the in-service meeting in their own classroom.

2. In-Service Meeting, February 8, 1971

The February in-service meeting was held at the Banneker Pre-School Center. Its theme was evaluation. The morning session was presented by Glenn Morgan, Head

Start Regional Training Officer. It was attended by all program personnel. The meeting began with a General Session where Mr. Morgan discussed the importance of self-evaluation in a preschool program. He then distributed self-evaluation forms and following the coffee break the participants were grouped by assignment (teachers, aides, cafeteria workers, etc.) to discuss the self-evaluation form.

The afternoon session was presented by Franklin W. Neff of the Institute for Community Studies. Only instructional and administrative personnel attended this session. Dr. Neff explained the classroom observation procedures, using PROSE, which were conducted in the ten sample classes. The total group then separated into three smaller groups to discuss the observation data gathered in the ten sample classrooms. Total data across the ten classes were provided for discussion.

Evaluation of the February Meeting. The intent of the Early Childhood Education staff training program is to obtain changed behavior through:

1. Information Input
2. Skill Modification
3. Attitudinal change, including the intention to act differently.

The questionnaire was designed to assess the degree to which the staff training meeting accomplished these goals. The questionnaires were distributed to 25 teachers and 7 other staff members at the end of the afternoon session (Appendix O). Participants were to complete and return them at that time. Return rates were low, only 19 questionnaires were returned. The low return may be attributed to the length of the meeting, level of participant interest, and the participant's unfamiliarity with on-the-spot evaluation.

The questionnaire had two parts. The first dealt with the morning session and the second the afternoon. These will be discussed in order. In questions 1 and 2, the participants were asked about the information they had gained. Responses relating to

the importance of setting goals and standards were most prevalent (11 and 3). These were followed by the non-judgmental nature of evaluation (3) and several single responses. The only other high area was criticism of the presentation (4). The response to what was most useful was more scattered with five responses referring to points Mr. Morgan had made in explaining evaluation and four to that part of the session which utilized the self-evaluation materials. A large number of the respondents (9) either left the item blank or indicated that they could not identify anything useful.

Item three related to usage of materials. Although 13 respondents indicated that they presently use self-evaluation tools, seven were vague in explaining what the tools were. Eleven respondents felt there was something in the presentation they could use, however, their responses were scattered and vague. Eight left the item blank. This is interpreted as meaning that they felt there was no information presented which they could use.

Question 5 tapped respondents' attitudes toward the difficulties involved in self-evaluation. Nearly half the group (9) felt that individuals lack objectivity in self-evaluation. Only two questionnaires were left blank in this area.

The follow-up questionnaires were delivered to the teaching sites and provisions were made for their anonymous return. Only 17 of the 32 questionnaires were returned.

The major intent of the follow-up questionnaire was to determine whether there had been any modification of behavior (Appendix P). The first question related to the self-evaluation forms distributed at the session. Ten respondents indicated they had completed the form, eight felt the self-evaluation materials had suggested changes and four had actually made changes. Four of the individuals who responded that they hadn't completed the forms provided an explanation. One had not received any and three said it wasn't compulsory to do so.

The second group of questions referred to development or use of self-evaluation tools. Of the 17, nine said they had developed or used such materials. Four respondents indicated the changes they had made as a result of self-evaluation, rather than the techniques they had used.

Of the four instructional staff members who returned questionnaires, two stated that they had observed an increase in the discussion and use of evaluation techniques.

The first three questions relating to the afternoon session were concerned with assessing information input. Of the 19 responses to the question, What were the most important points made?, eleven stated the evaluation procedures and seven stated information about the classes. To the question referring to the information they felt most useful to them; twelve stated the classroom data, two indicated the approach, six identified nothing, and one was vague. To the question on what information was least meaningful; specific categories were cited by six; reporting in percentages and the interpretations given by ICS were least meaningful to one person each. Eleven identified nothing as least meaningful.

Ten respondents felt the data reflected the program at their sites, four indicated they did not. Three did not respond. Twelve felt the information would affect their teaching, four did not, and three didn't answer. Six indicated specific data areas which would affect them while five were more vague about the effect it would have and one did not specify how.

Their thoughts about having observers in their own rooms were tapped in question five. Eleven indicated they would like to be observed with nine specifying why. None said they wouldn't want it, three indicated they did not care, and six did not respond to the item.

On the follow-up questionnaire (Appendix P), 14 of the respondents indicated they have reviewed the data, six felt the percentages were too high or too low. In

general, they indicated that the percentages were lower than they felt they should be rather than lower than they actually are. Thirteen felt changes should be made and 12 indicated that the needed changes had been made. Most changes which were cited related to increasing or decreasing the time spent on various activities.

Three of the four supervisors indicated that they felt the teachers had reviewed the data and all four said teachers had made changes or suggestions for change.

Discussion. The response rate to the February evaluation was not high. In general, the immediate responses were mixed and not too positive. The follow-up questionnaires indicated that the information and materials provided were used by a large percentage of the respondents, and specific behavioral changes were reported by more than half the responding group.

3. In-Service Meeting, March 8, 1971

The morning session of the March meeting was held at the Swope Parkway Preschool Center. All instructional personnel attended. The session began with a presentation by Miss Rosemary Beymer, Art Supervisor of the School District of Kansas City, Missouri, on the importance of art in the development in young children. Her talk was followed by workshop activities where each participant worked in six areas on art activities designed for children.

In the afternoon, the Early Childhood Education staff met at Swope Parkway Center. Eunice Livingston of the Institute for Pupil Studies discussed methods and procedures for working with children who scored low on the Denver Health and Neurological Screening Test. This was followed by a Montessori film and discussion presented by Jo Ann Walker, the ECE Montessori teacher.

The Head Start staff met in the afternoon at the Banneker Preschool Center. Elaine Alper of the Mercy Hospital Speech and Hearing Program discussed common

non-clinical speech problems of children and presented procedures and techniques for remediating the problems in the classroom.

Evaluation, March — A.M. Twenty-three of the 32 questionnaires were returned (Appendix Q). The responses to the information gained items were varied and generally positive. On question 1, twenty-six of the important points listed referred to developmental levels and the importance of individualization. On question 2, however, six individuals listed nothing as most useful to them.

The next series of questions dealt with the workshop activities. Staff reactions were varied and generally favorable. Most teachers found the sessions enjoyable and planned to use some of the activities in their own classrooms.

Follow-up questionnaires were delivered to the building; 21 were returned (Appendix R). The responses on the follow-up questionnaires indicated less emphasis on the variability of the developmental levels of children. Nine classes were reported as having all children at nearly the same developmental stage. All respondents had had art since the workshop and 22 different activities which were presented in the workshop had been used a total of 44 times.

P.M. — Swope Parkway. Eleven teachers completed the questionnaire on the afternoon session at Swope Parkway. Responses were positive and varied. Teachers cited many suggestions and a variety of activities they felt they could use. The film on Montessori was also well received (Appendix Q).

Eleven follow-up questionnaires were returned. Six of the teachers indicated that they had children with low scores on the Denver Test. Ten of them had used a total of 17 developmental activities presented by Mrs. Livingston (Appendix R).

Approaches presented in the Montessori film had been used by ten teachers with nine different activities listed.

P.M. — Banneker. Eleven questionnaires were returned on the speech and hearing session at Banneker. The teachers reported a variety of things which they felt were important and would be useful, however, only two of the eleven respondents listed things presented which they felt they could use (Appendix Q).

Ten follow-up questionnaires were returned. Eight of the teachers indicated they have children with common speech problems. Five had used a total of nine of the techniques presented by Mrs. Alper (Appendix R).

Discussion. Initial responses on the information provided and usefulness of the morning session and the afternoon session at Swope Parkway were highly positive. The P.M. session at Banneker was not as well received. The follow-up questionnaires indicated that the activities presented had been applied in most of the classrooms. The two notable changes were the decrease in their perception of the importance of developmental stages in art and the increased perception of the usefulness of the speech and hearing activities.

4. In-Service Meeting, May 10, 1971

The morning session of the May meeting was held at the Swope Parkway Center. All program personnel attended. Dr. Barker, Psychiatrist, discussed the major concepts of transactional analysis. She presented a concept, the participants then discussed it in groups of two or three. This was followed by a demonstration of the behavior for the total group. This format was repeated for each concept. At the end of the session, participants reviewed the concepts and demonstrated different roles.

In the afternoon, the teachers returned to their own buildings for individual activities which were not evaluated.

Discussion - May. Twenty-eight of the 32 questionnaires were returned (Appendix S). A range of points were reported as important. Nineteen felt the format of the session — presentation, discussion, and demonstration — was good. Fifteen felt the session had not provided ideas for helping children. There was a variety of responses to the helpful and not helpful aspects of the adult role. On the last question, only 14 cited information from the meeting. Six treated it as a question about the drug problem and eight left it blank.

Unfortunately, there was no follow-up on this in-service. From the pattern of others, it would be expected that the participants' understanding would increase and many of the concepts presented may have reached the classroom.

5. General Discussion

The evaluation of the staff training activities indicate that the immediate reaction of participants is not as favorable as the follow-up assessment. In the opinion of the teachers, the staff training meetings which were evaluated met the goals of in-service: to obtain changed behavior through: (1) information input, (2) skill modification, and (3) attitudinal change, including the intention to act differently. Each provided information which a majority of the respondents felt was important. Each provided suggestions for skill modification which was later tried in a majority of the classes. After each session, a majority of the participants at least intended to do something differently.

Behavioral change was greatest in those buildings where the supervisory personnel followed up the in-service meeting with building level discussions. The higher their concern about the information presented, the higher the behavior modification cited by teachers and the supervisory staff.

Question 10

Is Program Administration Effective?

In giving attention in an evaluation effort to the administration of a program, the intent is to assess whether the organization provided by persons in administrative positions supports the efficient operation of the program. This leads to consideration of whether such administrative functions as the following are attended to:

1. Providing clear statements of program goals and of appropriate ways of attaining those goals.
2. Defining jobs for different people such that all the work gets done and such that the work flows smoothly.
3. Providing facilities, equipment, materials, skilled personnel, and students.
4. Building information systems such that people are able to do their jobs and work smoothly with others.
5. Providing procedures which all personnel can use to influence decision-making and to influence the resolution of conflicts within the organization.
6. Providing rewards for work accomplishment.

Obviously, some of these are more, and some less, under the control of people in administrative roles in the program. Information about the performance of these functions can be used to improve internal (to the program) work but can also indicate needs for changes by the larger organization (the School District) of which the program is a part.

Interviews

In order to assess the areas of most relevant attitudes about administration — favorable, unfavorable, and conflicting — a list of areas of possible concerns were compiled in early February (Appendix T). By that time, we had had considerable

contact with personnel at all levels and had received input about the possible areas of program strength and weakness. This list was sent to all administrators of the program, one randomly selected instructional leader and psychologist and two randomly selected teachers, one from Early Childhood and one from the Head Start staff. Accompanying the list was a letter explaining its contents, requesting their additions and asking for an interview. All who received the materials scheduled interview times. Two Institute for Community Studies staff members compiled specific questions relating to the areas and interviewed the seven people during March. Each interviewed personnel from a range of responsibility levels and from both programs to reduce interviewer bias. The interviews lasted from two to five hours (the latter in two sessions) and were held at the school where the person interviewed was assigned.

The interview had four major purposes:

1. To assess the attitudes about the areas of concern contained on the list.
2. To identify other concerns if they existed.
3. To determine what attitudinal differences exist between levels — administrators and classroom teachers.
4. To determine what other attitudinal differences might exist between personnel.

At the end of March, the interviewers compiled their results and met to discuss the data gathered by area.

There appeared to be nearly total agreement in some areas and considerable differences in others. Concerns about audio-visual and playground equipment, instructional materials, cafeterias, teacher preparation, health services, parent participation, and the expenditure of funds ran high with all interviewed. All personnel praised the relationship they had had with the School District's Personnel and Buildings and Grounds Departments and the degree of dedication all staff members have toward children and the program.

The differences between the attitudes of personnel at different responsibility levels centered around the direction of the program. Lower level personnel felt the program was planned and controlled by the middle and upper level program staff. Whereas the upper level, and to a degree middle level, personnel felt that much of the decision-making and control rested outside the program staff. Administrators expressed a greater concern about the scope of the services offered. They felt the program should be expanded to include younger children and offer full day instruction. The teachers were not supportive of this.

Differences in role definition were also expressed. In general, the more experienced personnel were clearer about the specific responsibilities of the instructional leader and school psychologist. Newer personnel were not.

Questionnaires

The interview data were used as a guide to develop the administrative effectiveness questionnaire. Items were developed to assess each of the administrative functions discussed earlier in this section (see Appendix U). The questionnaire was distributed to all administrators, instructional leaders, psychologists, and classroom teachers at the May in-service meeting. Eighty-six percent (25 of 29) of the questionnaires for teachers and seventy-five percent (6 of 8) of the questionnaires for others were returned. All the questionnaires were completed, however, several respondents refused to answer single items or entire sections indicating that the questions were not applicable to them. Useful data were obtained to assess the administration's effectiveness according to each of the defined functions of administration:

1. Providing a Clear Statement of Program Goals and an Appropriate Way of Attaining Those Goals. The specific program objectives discussed in the first section of this evaluation report define the three objective areas as — Cognitive Development,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Affective Development, and Psychomotor Development. In an open-end question, the instructional staff (administrators, instructional leaders, psychologists, and teachers) were requested to indicate the major purpose of the preschool program. Nearly all respondents listed two or more purposes and over half the purposes listed were not specifically within the stated objective areas of the program (Table 10-1).

Table 10-1

What is the main purpose of a pre-school program?

	COGNITIVE	AFFECTIVE	PSYCHO MOTOR	SOCIAL	INCREASE EXPERIENCE	PREPARE FOR SCHOOL	COMPENSATE	NO RESPONSE
Teachers	9	7	3	9	7	8	2	1
Others	2	4	0	1	3	2	0	0

They were then asked to assess their clarity about what they are supposed to attain with the children, although most of the responses indicate that the staff is at least "clear enough," eight of the teachers (25% of those responding) stated they were not clear (Table 10-2).

Table 10-2

How clear have you been about what the program leaders expected you to attain with the children?

	VERY CLEARLY	QUITE CLEARLY	CLEARLY ENOUGH	NOT TOO CLEARLY	NOT AT ALL CLEARLY
Teachers	2	10	4	7	1
Others	3	2	1	0	0

Respondents generally felt the program expectations were about right but more than half the teachers felt the information they had had to do their job effectively was limited (Table 10-3).

Table 10-3

How appropriate have the expectations of the program leaders been, given the situation in which you had to work?

	MUCH TOO HIGH	TOO HIGH	BIT HIGH	ABOUT RIGHT	TOO LOW
Teachers	1	3	2	15	3
Others			1	5	

It appears that there were some difficulties in the communication and attainment of program objectives at both the classroom and administrative level. A clearer definition of objectives and procedures for their attainment is recommended (Table 10-4).

Table 10-4

Have you had the information you need (about the children, program supplies, program activities, schedules, available staff assistance, etc.) to do your job well?

	MUCH MORE	MORE	RIGHT AMOUNT	SOMEWHAT LESS	MUCH LESS
Teachers	1	0	10	9	4
Others	0	0	5	1	0

2. Defining Jobs for Different People Such That All the Work Gets Done and Such That the Work Flows Smoothly. Section 6 of the questionnaire dealt with role performance and assignment of primary responsibility. The figures in Table 10-5 dealt with role performance. Scanning the table horizontally, administering the program and working with parents were performed by individuals in all job classifications and the role of advising teachers is performed by all but one (teacher aides). The table also reveals on the vertical plane that one job classification, psychologist, was designated as performing all roles listed and another, instructional leader, all but one.

Table 10-6 addresses itself to designating the one person primarily responsible for each role. Although somewhat narrowed in scope, these data indicate that there is multiple assignment of responsibility to the educational psychologist and instructional leader. There is also overlap in who is seen as primarily responsible for administering the program and advising teachers.

Table 10-5

Assessment of Role Performance

	PROGRAM DIR.		EDUC DIR.		INSTR LEADR.		PSYCH.		TEACHERS		AIDES		OTHERS (WHO?)		
	T	O	T	O	T	O	T	O	T	O	T	O		T	O
Determine Policy	25	6	20	6	6	5	3	4	0	1	0	1	Parents Washington H.R.C.	2	1 1 1
Administer the Program	20	5	18	5	9	6	2	4	6	3	2	3	Volunteers		1
Supervise Teachers	3	1	10	4	24	6	5	3	0	0	0	0			
Advise Teachers	4	1	8	4	22	16	16	5	2	0	0	0	IPS		1
Teach Children	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	25	6	20	6	Volunteers Transp. Aide	1 1	
Assist in Teaching Children	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4	8	4	25	6	Parents IPS	1 1	
Help Children with Special Problems	0	0	0	1	4	3	24	6	17	4	12	3	Nurse Social Services IPS	3 1	1
Work with Parents	4	3	7	2	10	5	9	5	22	6	18	6	Social Services Parents Nurse Parent Involvement Coord.	7 4 2	2

Table 10-6

Assessment of Role Responsibility

	PROGRAM DIR.		EDUC. DIR.		INSTR. LEADER		PSYCH.		TEACHERS		AIDES		OTHERS (WHO?)		
	T	O	T	O	T	O	T	O	T	O	T	O		T	O
Determine Policy	15	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Administer the Program	9	1	7	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	No one	1	0
Supervise Teachers	0	0	0	0	16	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	No One	2	0
Advise Teachers	0	0	2	0	13	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	No One	1	0
Teach Children	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	6	0	0		0	0
Assist in Teaching Children	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	2		0	0
Help Children with Special Problems	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	3	5	0	0	0			
Work with Parents	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	13	1	0	0	Everyone	2	

A question on role definition appeared in Section VII of the questionnaire (see Table 10-7).

Table 10-7

How clearly have your duties and responsibilities been defined this year?

	VERY CLEARLY	QUITE CLEARLY	CLEARLY ENOUGH	NOT TOO CLEARLY	NOT AT ALL CLEARLY
T	2	6	10	7	0
O	2	3	1	0	0

These data indicate that the teachers were considerably less clear about their own duties and responsibilities than the other respondents with twenty-eight percent (28%) indicating they were not too clear.

Section III of the questionnaire was an assessment of the ancillary services which were provided to assist the staff with special problems. The respondents were requested to indicate their degree of involvement with the service, how helpful they felt it had been, and how much they felt it needed to be changed (see Table 10-8). Teachers indicated they were most involved with the Institute for Pupil Studies program and health services and least involved with speech and hearing and volunteers. They felt health services the Institute for Pupil Studies and transportation had helped them most. Speech and hearing and the Institute for Community Studies evaluation had helped least. They indicated parent participation, speech and hearing, and health services needed the greatest change with the Institute for Pupil Studies and transportation activities needing the least.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 10-8

Assessment of Ancillary Services

ACTIVITY	TEACHER									OTHERS								
	Contact			Help			Change			Contact			Help			Change		
	G	S	N	G	S	N	G	S	N	G	S	N	G	S	N	G	S	N
1. Parent Participation	6	19	0	5	16	1	10	8	1	3	3	0	2	4	0	3	2	1
2. Volunteers	6	13	4	9	9	4	5	10	6	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	2	1
3. Evaluation (ICS)	10	11	1	5	8	4	4	12	0	2	3	0	2	3	0	0	5	0
4. Institute for Pupil Studies	12	12	1	10	11	1	2	13	3	6	0	0	6	0	0	1	2	1
5. Speech and Hearing	3	11	9	5	7	9	8	10	3	1	3	2	1	2	2	3	1	2
6. Social Services	10	11	4	8	10	4	6	8	6	3	3	0	4	1	1	3	0	2
7. Health Services	10	13	2	11	9	2	7	10	3	2	4	0	2	3	1	2	2	2
8. Transportation	10	10	4	12	6	3	4	10	5	1	4	0	3	2	0	1	3	1
9. Other (What?)																		

The others (administrators, instructional leaders, and psychologist) responded to this section somewhat differently. They felt they were most involved with the Institute for Pupil Studies, parent participation, and social services and least with volunteers. They felt the Institute for Pupil Studies and social services were most useful with speech and hearing least. They indicated that parent participation and speech and hearing needed the greatest change while the Institute for Pupil Studies required the least.

Perhaps the differences in responsibility areas explain the differences in responses here. Strongly negative comments from teachers on the usefulness of the social services might indicate a conflict in perception about what social services should accomplish. It is difficult to compare the frequency of responses in three areas: volunteers, evaluation (ICS), and speech and hearing. Volunteers were only assigned to Head Start classes, evaluation involved only nine teachers directly and speech and hearing operated in just one center.

Although generally favorable, there is great variability in the assessment of each of the ancillary services. This indicates that either the services provided were not uniform at all sites or the expectations of staff members were not uniform.

There appears to be lack of clarity in the definition of roles and non-uniformity in the performance of roles. This is to be anticipated in a new program. After a year's experience, the staff should be able to better define responsibilities. The present overlap probably produces confusion and considerable delay in decision-making.

3. Providing Facilities, Equipment, Materials, Skilled Personnel, and Students. The first section of the questionnaire requested an assessment of the Quality, Quantity, and Means for Acquiring materials, supplies, and equipment. The respondent rated each

type as excellent, adequate, or limited in each area — Quality, Quantity, and Acquisition. A space was also provided for comments (Tables 10-9, 10-10, and 10-11).

The responses by both groups, teachers and others, indicate that Quality exceeds Quantity in all areas, except playground equipment. Classroom furniture and fixtures were rated highest by both groups followed by instructional materials by teachers and consumable supplies by Others.

The rating of Quantity was higher than Means of Acquisition in all areas. Once again classroom furniture and fixtures were rated highest followed by instructional materials and consumable supplies by both groups of respondents.

Means for Acquisition was rated lowest. In all areas more teachers marked the limited response as much or more than any other response. In the comments section, teachers indicated that they purchase instructional materials and consumable supplies when they aren't available. More expensive items, like classroom equipment or temporary durable materials, they do without.

These data indicate that the respondents rank their materials, supplies, and equipment excellent to adequate in Quality, adequate in Quantity, and adequate to limited in Means for Acquisition. Greater involvement of teachers in the selection of these items might improve their assessment of the Quality. Greater experience with the needs of the classrooms and improved allocation of funds for purchasing sufficient quantities of these items should improve difficulties with Quantity.

It appears that specific changes should be made in providing the materials for classroom use. Suggestions made by the teachers included:

1. Provide building budgets so purchases can be made as they arise during the year.
2. Provide a centralized storage and distribution center in each building so materials can be obtained when needed.
3. Develop a curriculum library or resource center in each building for books, audio-visual equipment, and temporary durable materials.

Table 10-9

Assessment of Materials, Supplies, and Equipment Quality

TYPE	TEACHER			OTHERS		
	E	A	L	E	A	L
1. Classroom furniture & fixtures (such as chalkboards, cupboards, sinks, easels, tables, chairs)	12	9	3	5	0	0
2. Classroom equipment (such as projectors, record players, tape recorders, slides)	8	10	5	2	2	1
3. Instructional materials (such as books, magazines, puzzles, toy stoves, games)	9	11	4	3	2	0
4. Consumable supplies (such as paper, crayons, craft materials, soap, clay)	7	13	4	4	1	0
5. Temporary durable materials (such as films, records, pictures, pets, plants)	4	9	11	2	2	1
6. Playground equipment	2	7	15	1	3	1
7. Other (What?)						
Creative Materials	0	0	2	0	0	0
Peabody Kits	0	0	1	0	0	0

Table 10-10

Assessment of Materials, Supplies, and Equipment
Quantity

TYPE	TEACHER			OTHERS		
	E	A	L	E	A	L
1. Classroom furniture & fixtures (such as chalkboards, cupboards, sinks, easels, tables, chairs)	8	13	4	2	3	0
2. Classroom equipment (such as projectors, record players, tape recorders, slides)	4	7	13	2	1	1
3. Instructional materials (such as books, magazines, puzzles, toy stoves, games)	9	11	4	2	5	2
4. Consumable supplies (such as paper, crayons, craft materials, soap, clay)	5	6	13	2	2	0
5. Temporary durable materials (such as films, records, pictures, pets, plants)	3	4	16	0	2	2
6. Playground equipment	2	2	20	0	2	3
7. Other (What?)						
Creative Materials	0	0	2	0	0	0
Peabody Kits	0	1	0	0	0	0

Table 10-11

Assessment of Materials, Supplies, and Equipment Acquisition

TYPE	TEACHER			OTHER		
	E	A	L	E	A	L
1. Classroom furniture & fixtures (such as chalkboards, cupboards, sinks, easels, tables, chairs)	5	11	8	2	2	0
2. Classroom equipment (such as projectors, record players, tape recorders, slides)	5	5	14	2	1	1
3. Instructional materials (such as books, magazines, puzzles, toy stoves, games)	2	11	11	1	3	0
4. Consumable supplies (such as paper, crayons, craft materials, soap, clay)	4	7	13	2	1	1
5. Temprary durable materials (such as films, records, pictures, pets, plants)	2	2	19	0	2	2
6. Playground equipment	2	3	19	0	3	2
7. Other (What?) Creative Materials	0	0	2	0	0	0
Peabody Kits	0	1	0	0	0	0

The second part of the questionnaire dealt with the facilities available. Respondents were requested to consider the building where they taught when they responded. The administrators, instructional leaders, and psychologists, who worked in more than one building, were requested to consider all their assignment locations in their responses.

Four aspects of the physical plant were assessed — the building itself, the cafeteria, playground, and classroom. From three to five areas were listed for each of these, i.e., location, size, facilities, etc. Table 10-12 presents the responses of both groups. The range of responses reflects the range of facilities in the different preschool sites. Highly rated by teachers were the appearance and cleanliness of buildings; location of cafeterias and playgrounds; location of facilities and lighting in classrooms. Lowest rated were the location of buildings; facilities, food, and menu of cafeterias; facilities of playground; and size of classrooms.

Responses by administrators, instructional leaders, and psychologist were considerably higher to all aspects except the cafeteria.

The responses to this section suggest that the cafeteria and playground facilities are of greatest concern. The latter supports information reported in the previous sections. Small classroom size is also a problem in the teacher's eyes. Suggestions for remediating the cafeteria would include a review of menu selection and food preparation. Although the menus are "planned for children," comments indicate that the four-year-olds cannot eat all that is served and that dishes are too highly seasoned for them. Perhaps selections are based on the tastes of elementary school children which may differ from younger children. The playground problem, at least at the preschool sites, centers on the facilities more than the size or location. This problem could be solved by installing permanent, outside, preschool equipment at the sites. The size of classrooms is more

Table 10-12

Assessment of Facilities

SITE	FACILITY	TEACHER			OTHERS		
		E	A	L	E	A	L
The Buildings	LOCATION	13	7	13	5	0	1
	APPEARANCE	14	9	1	6	0	0
	FACILITIES	8	13	2	5	1	0
	CLEANLINESS	11	6	6	6	0	0
	SIZE	6	11	6	2	4	0
The Cafeteria's	LOCATION	10	8	5	6	0	0
	FACILITIES	6	8	9	4	1	1
	FOOD	5	8	10	4	2	0
	MENU	3	8	12	2	4	0
The Playground's	LOCATION	10	8	7	5	1	0
	FACILITIES	3	5	16	0	3	3
	SIZE	5	11	7	4	1	1
Your Classroom's	LOCATION	11	11	2	5	0	0
	FACILITIES	10	8	5	3	2	0
	SIZE	8	9	7	3	1	1
	HEAT	9	12	3	4	1	0
	LIGHT	13	9	2	4	1	0

difficult to handle unless other sites are available for the location of preschool classes or financing available for smaller class loads.

The fourth section of the questionnaire dealt with preparation for preschool teaching. Types of preparation were listed, i.e., educational courses, experience, etc., and the respondents rated the importance of each on a five step scale from Very Important to Not At All Important. For both groups there were only two types of preparation ranked Not At All Important — Being A Parent (4) and In-Service Training (1) (see Table 10-13).

The median response for teachers was Quite Important for all types of preparation except two. In-Service Training received a median response of Very Important. The median response for Being A Parent was Not Too Important. Ratings by the others were somewhat lower. In-Service Training received a median response of Very Important. Courses in education and teaching experience received a median response of Quite Important. For all other types of preparation, the median rank was between Quite Important and Important.

These data suggest that the present emphasis on in-service should be maintained and the program should place a priority on employing experienced teachers. An interesting conflict exists between the interview data and the questionnaires. Formal education courses were cited as "nearly useless, perhaps detrimental" by several persons interviewed, however, they received a Quite Important ranking from teachers and others.

The second part of section IV dealt with factors which had contributed to success in attaining goals during the school year. Once again the respondents rated the factors on a five level scale which ranged from Very Helpful to Not At All Helpful. Job security and fringe benefits, an additional entry by a respondent, was the only area rated Not At All Helpful (see Table 10-14).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 10-13

Assessment of Preparation and Training

	TEACHER					OTHERS				
	VERY IMPOR-TANT	QUITE IMPOR-TANT	IMPOR-TANT	NOT TOO IMPOR-TANT	NOT AT ALL IMPOR-TANT	VERY IMPOR-TANT	QUITE IMPOR-TANT	IMPOR-TANT	NOT TOO IMPOR-TANT	NOT AT ALL IMPOR-TANT
Special university training for pre-school teaching	8	8	8	1	0	2	1	3	0	0
Courses in Educational Methods	11	6	4	4	0	1	3	2	0	0
Courses in Psychology	8	8	7	2	0	1	2	3	0	0
Courses in Sociology	7	6	9	3	0	1	2	3	0	0
Teaching experience	12	8	5	0	0	3	1	2	0	0
Community work experience	6	8	9	2	0	3	0	2	1	0
Being a parent	2	3	4	13	3	0	3	0	2	1
In-service training	13	6	3	3	1	5	1	0	0	0
Other (What?) Job Security (contracts-benefits)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liking people	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attitudes toward children, love for children, dedication	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-14

. Assessment of Contributors to Success

	TEACHER					OTHERS				
	VERY HELPFUL	QUITE HELPFUL	SOME-WHAT HELPFUL	NOT TOO HELPFUL	NOT AT ALL HELPFUL	VERY HELPFUL	QUITE HELPFUL	SOME-WHAT HELPFUL	NOT TOO HELPFUL	NOT AT ALL HELPFUL
Your previous training	14	6	4	0	0	5	1	0	0	0
Your previous experience	16	9	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0
Program objectives & guides	9	5	8	2	0	3	3	0	0	0
Teaching materials	9	12	3	0	0	1	1	2	0	0
In-service training	8	6	7	3	0	1	2	2	0	0
University courses	8	4	9	2	0	3	1	1	0	0
Supervisory staff	7	9	4	4	0	3	1	1	0	0
Other teachers	1	14	8	2	0	3	2	0	0	0
Other program staff	2	10	11	2	0	4	0	1	0	0
Other (What?) Own reading, study, observe	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Job security, fringe benefits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Principals cooperation	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Half day work	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IPS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

The teachers' median response was Very Helpful in two areas — Previous Training and Previous Experience. It was Quite Helpful in all other areas except Other Program Staff, which was ranked Somewhat Helpful. The responses by others differed somewhat. Previous Training, Previous Experience, and Other Program Staff received a median rank of Very Helpful. All other areas except teaching materials, and in-service training received a median rank of Quite Helpful.

For both groups of respondents Previous Training and Experience were seen as the major contributors to their success. This is in general agreement with the way they ranked the importance for preparation items. Of interest is the shift in the rating of In-Service. Its value for preparation was highly rated, however, it was not rated as high in contributing to success. This would suggest an assessment of the content of this year's in-service program. It is inferred that the teachers feel In-Service did not attain its potential.

4. Building Information Systems Such That People Are Able to Do Their Jobs and Work Smoothly with Others. Only one question dealt with information provided to the respondent. It was in Section VII of the questionnaire. It asked whether the respondent had been provided with sufficient information to do his job effectively. The median response for teachers was Less Than Needed and for the Other respondents it was About Right (Table 10-15).

Table 10-15

Have you had the information you need (about children, program supplies, program activities, schedules, available staff assistance, etc.) to do your job well?

	TOO MUCH	MORE THAN NEEDED	ABOUT RIGHT	LESS THAN NEEDED	TOO LITTLE
Teachers	1	0	11	9	4
Others	0	0	5	1	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Combining these responses with others discussed, particularly lack of uniformity in program goals and lack of clarity about duties and responsibilities (discussed earlier), it would appear that the information systems could be improved in the program. Once again it must be stated that this is the initial year, however, the differences between responses by teachers and others are considerable. It is possible that the information available to the administrative and support personnel is not adequately transmitted to the classroom teachers.

5. Providing Procedures which All Personnel Can Use to Influence Decision-Making to Influence the Resolution of Conflicts within the Organization. In Section V of the questionnaire, the respondents were requested to rank the impact they felt certain groups or individuals had had on the development of the program this year. They were then asked to rank how much influence they felt the group or individual should have in the future. Ranking ranged from 1 to 10 in each case.

Considering first the number of groups or individuals who were ranked the first and second times, the teachers decreased the number ranked while the others increased the number ranked (Table 10-16). This could indicate that teachers felt a need for the involvement of fewer groups or individuals in decision-making while the others felt a need for more involvement.

The rank order for each group or individual is also reported in Table 10-16. There were four shifts in ranking by the teachers. Most notable was the shift for teacher from a ranking of 7 to 2. They also elevated the ranking position of Parents 9 to 7 and decreased the position of Preschool Traditions 4 to 9. Shifts in the ranking by administrators were numerous. Only the ECE administrators, the Human Resources Corporation, and Model Cities remained about the same. Teachers and Parents received the greatest upward (6.0 to 1.0 and 9.5 to 3.0) change while Washington and Preschool Traditions demonstrated the greatest downward shift (4.0 to 9.0 and 9.5 to 10.0).

Table 10-16

Ranking of Influence — This Year and Next Year

	Teachers		Others	
	Rank This Year N=6	Rank Next Year N=6	Rank This Year N=22	Rank Next Year N=23
Pre-School Traditions	4.0	9.0	7.5	10.0
Washington, D.C.	10.0	10.0	4.0	9.0
K.C. School District Staff	8.0	8.0	5.0	7.0
Model Cities	11.0	11.0	7.5	8.0
Human Resources Corporation	5.0	6.0	11.0	11.0
Parent Advisory Committee	6.0	5.0	9.5	6.0
Assistant Superintendent	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.5
Program Director	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.5
ECE Administrators	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
Teachers	7.0	2.0	6.0	1.0
Parents	9.0	7.0	9.5	3.0

These data indicate that both respondent groups desire some change in those who influence decision-making. Both are recommending greater influence for those groups which are most directly in contact with the children — Teachers, Parents, and Program Administrators.

6. Providing Rewards for Work Accomplished. Five questions in the final section of the questionnaire dealt with the issue of rewards and job satisfaction (see Table 10-17). Five levels of response were provided. For all questions, but one, the median response for the teachers was at the third level — right in the middle. The Others responded somewhat more positively, but most of their responses were also about in the middle.

It is concluded that personal rewards, either monetary, praise, or self-satisfaction, were not viewed by the staff (teachers or others) as being particularly high.

Table 10-17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Questions from Section VII - Rewards for work accomplished.

How clear have you been about how good a job the instructional leader thinks you are doing?

	VERY CLEARLY	QUITE CLEARLY	CLEARLY ENOUGH	NOT TOO CLEARLY	NOT AT ALL CLEARLY
Teachers	5	7	7	5	1
Others	1	3			

How do you feel about the pay you have received?

	VERY HIGH	QUITE HIGH	ABOUT RIGHT	SOMEWHAT LOW	VERY LOW
Teachers			17	8	
Others			5	1	

How do you feel about the recognition you have received for your work this year?

	GREAT DEAL	QUITE A BIT	SOME	LITTLE	ALMOST NONE
Teachers	1	9	12	1	1
Others	1	2	3		

How much opportunity have you had this year to do things in your work that you really enjoy doing?

	GREAT DEAL	QUITE A BIT	SOME	LITTLE	ALMOST NONE
Teachers	3	12	2	8	
Others	1	4		1	

All things considered, how satisfied are you with the way the pre-school program has worked this year?

	VERY SATISFIED	QUITE SATISFIED	FAIRLY SATISFIED	NOT TOO SATISFIED	NOT AT ALL SATISFIED
Teachers	3	8	8	5	0
Others	1	4	1		

Discussion

The data discussed thus far are well summarized by the response to the wide range question on administrative effectiveness (Table 10-18).

Table 10-18

From what you observed, how well organized and administered has the pre-school program been this year?

	EXCEPTIONALLY	VERY	QUITE	FAIRLY	NOT TOO
T	2	7	3	6	7
O	0	3	2	1	0

The median response for teachers is Fairly Well, not a positive assessment of administrative effectiveness. The median response for the other group was between Very Well and Quite Well administered. Although above the mid-ranking, this is not a high assessment of administrative effectiveness considering it comes from the most affected group, those responsible for organizing and administering the program.

The above discussion has indicated some of the greatest areas of concern; acquisition of equipment, supplies, and materials; communication of information; involvement of teachers in decision-making; and role definition. These problems are not infrequent in first year programs. Specific actions must be taken, however, to prevent a repetition of the problems. Some of the suggested actions would be:

1. Greater lead time in the planning of the program.
2. Involvement of teachers and parents in the definition of goals and objectives.
3. Finer definition of program goals.
4. Finer definition of roles.
5. Communication and monitoring of role performance.

Question 11

Are Children with Special Problems Which Affect Their Educational Development Provided the Assistance They Need in Order to Make Progress toward Eventual Achievement in the Area of Program Objectives?

The purpose of the evaluation was two-fold (1) to assess the effectiveness of procedures of the Division of Urban Education in identifying and referring problem and/or handicapped children, (2) to determine the adequacy of procedures followed by the Institute for Pupil Studies for receiving referrals; initiating contacts; preparing diagnosis; prescribing remediation; conducting, assisting or monitoring the program of services for these children; and counselling and assisting their parents.

The design of the evaluation provided for (1) a review of documents and records of the Early Childhood Development Program, (2) an assessment of the appropriateness of recommendations and the implementation for a selected sample of IPS cases, (3) the observation of two special education classrooms in operation, (4) interviews with selected Early Childhood Development Program staff and with all IPS staff, and (5) preparation of a written summary of findings and recommendations.

Arrangements were made with Dr. Joseph Weaver, Chief Psychologist, Associate Professor Pediatric Psychology, Kansas University Medical Center, to carry out the specified evaluation activities. The following is a summary of his evaluation report which appears in Appendix V.

Summary of Evaluation Report

"The IPS staff has devised adequate, economical, and efficient procedures for identifying and referring ECE-HS children likely to have school adjustment problems related to physical, developmental, psychological, social and emotional problems and handicaps. Similarly, their system for making contacts, diagnosing children, prescribing remediation, and conducting, assisting and monitoring the special program of services to these children and their families is both adequate and professionally competent. Indeed, the staff seem very well trained in their specialties and possess considerable experience.

The previous experience of working together of several core members has probably been a strong contributing factor to the smoothness of the operation. Consumers of their services, i.e. ECE-HS supervisors and workers and the parents of the children, are loud in their praises of the benefits of having IPS in operation. I also feel from my study of IPS records, meetings with IPS, ECE, and HS personnel and with parents (as well as from direct observation of the children and their classes) that IPS is providing the integrating professional efforts needed to help such handicapped children, their generally overwhelmed families, and the valiant but often also overwhelmed schools and teachers. I would definitely recommend continuance of this fine project. Indeed, it could profitably be offered increased support."

The evaluation found that IPS has developed an efficient, economical, and comprehensive system of identification and referral ranging from brief formal individual testing (Denver Developmental Screening Test) through informal contacts with teachers, to in-depth multi-disciplinary evaluations of virtually all children in the project. It appeared that IPS's provision of personalized services insured that physical, social, and emotional evaluations and treatment would be undertaken. The marked improvement of 13 (hyperactive) children appeared to be one of the program's outstanding achievements.

Dr. Weaver saw IPS as providing an integrated, generally sequenced, progressively more intensive, multi-disciplinary program of diagnosis and treatment. IPS staff routinely incorporated recommendations of medical and school consultants in their procedure. The staff were well trained and professionally competent and possessed extensive experience. They handled the coordination of complicated psychological, educational, and health problems with great skill and worked ably with parents.

Perhaps most importantly the evaluation found that the children both enjoyed and profitted from their instructions, particularly those in the special small classrooms. As a result, Dr. Weaver strongly recommends continuance of the project and increased fundings to implement the following recommendations:

1. Provide for early screening (preferably in the first two months of the school year) with DDST so that children might be referred earlier and treatment begun sooner.

2. Provide for supplementary medical examinations (psychiatric, neurological) to aid in identifying problem and/or handicapped children.

3. Provide for increased auditory, speech and language evaluation by means of the addition of a speech and language specialist to the IPS staff.

4. Provide for the visual screening of children who fail the "E" chart test incorporating the use of the flash card vision test for children.

5. Provide for the calculation and recording of results of psychological, developmental, and educational past testing in confidential files.

6. Provide for the revision of the criteria for categorizing children especially as related to categories of "hyperactive" and "mentally retarded"

7. Provide for the services of a medical consultant (preferably a pediatrician) and a doctoral level allied health professional consultant (audiologist, psychologist, speech pathologist, and so forth) for brief review of difficult diagnostic or treatment cases.

8. Provide for the expansion of in-service training by IPS for Early Childhood supervisors and teachers, particularly in the areas of casework, supervision, and remedial education.

9. Provide for the use of specialized psychometric testing instruments (Merrill-Palmer, Leiter, and Wppsi) rather than Stanford Binet inasmuch as such tests take into account these children's specific disabilities and/or deprivation.

10. Provide for the consultation of a specialist in the psychological testing of children with hearing or language deficits to help revise assessment procedures.

11. Provide for the improvement of record keeping, especially in regard to tests results.

12. Provide for follow-up, particularly in regard to the placement of multiply handicapped children in special small classes to insure individual programming.

13. Provide for the investment of increased funds in instructional curriculum materials.

14. Provide for the initiation of group efforts in order to enhance and multiply IPS workers' effectiveness by means of more intensive and continuing in-service training efforts in the areas of social work and teaching and by means of a small group program for parents to be conducted by IPS social workers and psychiatric counselors.

Question 12

What Changes in Program Should Be Made?

a. What Objectives Were Not Satisfactorily Attained?

As discussed in Questions 2 and 4, children participating in the preschool program demonstrated significant objective attainment as measured by the pre and post test instruments and the interim objective checklists. Teachers indicated, however, that they were not clear, at times, about the specific objectives. Several stated that their primary guide for interim objectives was the checklist. In addition, a few teachers indicated that they felt some of the specific objectives were too difficult or advanced for preschool children.

Although no systematic data were gathered specifically for this question, responses to several of the questions on the Administrative Effectiveness questionnaire (discussed in Question 10) indicate that the teachers were "not too clear" about program objectives. To improve this situation, the following changes should be made:

1. Specific overall objectives should be communicated to the teaching staff before the school begins.
2. Interim objectives, refined from the 1970-1971 checklists, should be distributed to teachers.
3. Teaching, other instructional and administrative personnel should work together to further delimit and refine the interim objectives, stating them in behavioral terms for greater classroom use.
4. As part of the review, consideration should be given to the variation which may be appropriate for different students and teachers.

b. What Program Elements Seem Most Related to Change? Least?

Analyses reported under Question 6 do not provide clear definitions of program elements which are in turn related to program outcomes. Therefore, no guidance can be provided from the data to determine suggestions for changes in the program. There were differences in the time spent on particular kinds of interaction and the time spent on some

instructional activities among the classes. The lack of a clear link between these differences and pupil outcomes suggests those elements, by themselves, may not be producing differential outcomes.

It might be suggested that the instructional members of the program staff clarify with each other the principal classroom elements they believe are most related to student outcomes. By systematically noting the presence and absence of these elements they could determine the differences between class on those dimensions. Combining this with a measure of differences in pupil attainment they could make a better determination of the program elements which are related to change.

c. What Other Factors May Have Been Obstacles to Program Success?

The ECE Program was markedly successful in attainment of pupil growth objectives. Problem areas were identified by program personnel in the course of the program and in the interviews described in Question 10. It is not possible to say whether these factors were obstacles to pupil success, but they did have an impact on the general operation of the program.

At least three areas are seen as having an impact on program success —clarity of objectives (which was discussed above) ; clarity of role definition and performance; and program direction. Each of these problem areas is discussed in greater detail under Question 10. Specific suggestions for change would include:

1. Greater involvement of teachers in the development of operational class objectives.
2. Finer definition of roles and closer monitoring of role performance.
3. Increased emphasis on planning and early decision-making to provide a definitive schedule of program activities and expectations.
4. Improved communication of information about program status to all levels of participants.

Summary

Considering the success of this program it is difficult to defend widesweeping suggestions for program changes. Planning, definition of roles and objectives as well as communication appear to be problem areas. These are to be expected in any first year program. The degree to which these weaknesses influenced the effectiveness of the program cannot be determined. It is assumed, however, that improvement in these areas would have a favorable impact on the overall operation of the program.

APPENDICES

	Page
A. OVERALL OBJECTIVES FOR BASIC PROGRAM	A-1
B. REQUESTED OBJECTIVES OF THE MONTESSORI CLASSROOM	A-5
C. FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD INTERIM CHECKLISTS AND PERCENTAGE OF ATTAINMENT–SAMPLE BASIC PROGRAM CLASSES	A-8
D. FIRST AND SECOND INTERIM CHECKLIST ITEMS AND AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF ATTAINMENT — SAMPLE MONTESSORI CLASSES	A-17
E. PROSE CATEGORIES	A-25
F. INTERCODER RELIABILITY ON PROSE	A-30
G. INSTRUMENT DESCRIPTION	A-35
H. INSTRUMENTS USED WITH PARENTS	A-54
I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PRESCHOOL AGE CHILD	A-61
J. A PORTRAIT OF THE KINDERGARTEN CHILD	A-64
K. EARLY CHILDHOOD-HEAD START EDUCATION PROGRESS REPORT	A-66
L. REVIEW TEST I	A-68
M. REVIEW TEST II	A-71
N. EVALUATION OF PRE-SERVICE TRAINING MEETING	A-74
O. EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT, FEB. 8, 1971 – FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE	A-80
P. EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT, FEB. 8, 1971 – FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE	A-84
Q. EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT, MARCH 8, 1971	A-87
R. MARCH 8, 1971, STAFF TRAINING — FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE	A-93
S. STAFF DEVELOPMENT – MAY 10 IN-SERVICE	A-96
T. EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS	A-99
U. PRE-SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE	A-101
V. EVALUATION OF MODEL CITIES PROJECT FOR IDENTIFICATION, REMEDIATION AND BEHAVIORAL MANAGEMENT OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN THE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM	A-112

APPENDIX A

OVERALL OBJECTIVES FOR BASIC PROGRAM

The objectives developed by program leadership at the beginning of the school year are provided in this document.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Early Childhood Education
Headstart Program
Division of Urban Education
School District of Kansas City, Missouri

Goals and Objectives for The Early Childhood Education Program

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

I. Language

To expand and develop the ability to communicate effectively in standard English i.e.

- listen with acuity and discrimination.
- understand directions, questions, statements.
- use and understand nouns, verbs, connecting, positional and other descriptive words.
- speak in complete sentences when necessary.
- carry on a simple conversation.
- express verbally feelings and opinions.
- recognize and reproduce visual symbols i.e. signs, letters, word, etc.
- know sound-symbol relationships.

II. Abstract Concepts

To expand and develop concept understanding and usage i.e.

- symbol memorization - letters, numbers.
- order - sequence, serialization, seriation.
- distinguishing features - color, size, shape, quantity.
- classification - likenesses and differences, matching, grouping, etc.
- relationships - spatial, numerical, configuration, coloration

III. Synthesizing Behavior

A. To expand and develop the ability to move toward independent thinking i.e.

- make choices
- ask questions
- solve problems

AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT

I. Self Concept

To develop a positive self-image and respect for others i.e.

- knows his full name, address, age, names of people with whom he lives.
- knows own body parts.
- awareness of surroundings.
- recognizes emotions - fear, anger, frustration, hate, love.
- expresses emotions in acceptable ways

PSYCHO - MOTOR DEVELOPMENT

I. Manipulative Skills

To develop control of the body to perform specific skills i.e.

- move thru space - walk, run, skip, climb.
- grasp, hold, move, release objects.
- know left and right
- develop eye-hand coordination with scissors, puzzles, crayons, blocks, beads, brushes.
- use body for creative expression - charades, dancing, marching, dramatizing.

APPENDIX B

REQUESTED OBJECTIVES OF MONTESSORI CLASSROOM

The staff respondents for the Montessori program were asked to develop a statement of objectives for the purposes of this evaluation. Such a statement was prepared and is in Appendix B.

REQUESTED OBJECTIVES OF MONTESSORI CLASSROOM*

Objectives of the curricular activities and experiences offered in the Prepared Montessori Environment.

These are broadly classified in four areas:

A. MOTOR ACTIVITIES:

1. To develop muscular control and coordination with:
   a. Physical activities both outside and inside.
   b. Organized games, music and action songs.
   c. Manipulative skills in Exercises of Practical Life.
2. To promote care of self and of Environment.
3. To acquire refinement in use of body with balance and poise of movements.
4. To create an awareness of grace and courtesy in social behavior and inter-relationships with humanity.
5. To inculcate self-discipline and self-direction as the keystones for gaining Independence and sense of Responsibility.

B. SENSORY EXPERIENCES WITH MATERIALS FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1. To develop acuity of observation, discrimination and discernment of the physical senses as the basis for keen perception.
2. To give basic keys for the understanding and recognition of the qualities and aspects of things in the environment.
3. To build accurate visual concepts, images and symbolizations.
4. To facilitate spontaneous exploration of the outer environment both of nature's and man-made.
5. To further meaning of usage of words in the fields of language and mathematics.

C. EXERCISES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGE:

1. To enrich and extend vocabulary of daily usage.
2. To increase knowledge of more scientific vocabulary in order to open out the Cosmic world.
   a. geography
   b. botany
   c. zoology
   d. mathematics
   e. arts and sciences

---

*Prepared by Miss Lena Wickramaratne and Mrs. Sue Seaman.

3. To develop the mechanical skills in preparation for acquisition of reading and writing skills.

4. To bring a greater awareness of language as a means of expression and communication.

5. To cultivate an appreciation for the beauty of speech, poetry, prose and song.

D. EXERCISES IN SENSORY GEOMETRY AND NUMBER:

1. To bring discrimination of geometric form and dimensions.

2. To develop discemment of contrasts, identities, similarities, differences and relationships in the Formation of the Mathematical Mind.

3. To understand and visualize mathematical abstractions.

4. To learn appropriate mathematical vocabulary with their underlying facts.

5. To bring the world of arithmetical concepts and the reality of the functioning of number for developing skills in mental computation.

APPENDIX C

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD INTERIM CHECKLISTS AND PERCENTAGE OF ATTAINMENT

SAMPLE BASIC PROGRAM CLASSES

First, Second, and Third Interir hecklists and Percentage of Attainment
Sample Basic . rogram Classes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LANGUAGE: LISTENING

	1st Checklist November 30, 1970 8 classes, 148 students	2nd Checklist January 29, 1971 8 classes, 141 students	3rd Checklist March 26, 1971 8 classes, 148 students
Attends to own name:			
hears it	98%		
responds (verbal or non-verbal)	95		
Follows simple direction:			
"stand up"	98		
"bring me _____"	93		
Listens to and carries out two directions:			
"Bring me a ball and a block"		93%	
"Stand up and walk to the door"		85	
Carries out three directions: Get the cup and plate and put them on the table			96%
Listens and identifies environmental sounds:			
dog	84		
cat	84		
car horn		87	
knock		75	
city (horn, siren)			74
home (vacuum, doorbell)			62
zoo			45
Designates loud and soft:			
musical sound	39		68
vocal sound	49		67
Listens to entire nursery rhyme or short story: i.e.			
Humpty Dumpty, Three Bears	95		
Distinguishes high and low sounds			34
Distinguishes between sound of:			
bell			93
cough			92
clap			89
crumpling paper			64
Identify and say rhyming words (i.e. cat, rat; fall, ball)			53

LANGUAGE: SPEAKING

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1st Checklist November 30, 1970 8 classes, 148 students		2nd Checklist January 29, 1971 8 classes, 141 students		3rd Checklist March 26, 1971 8 classes, 148 students	
Speaks own full name	86%	Speaks first name	89%	Distinguishes between	
Uses affirmative and negative concepts:		Speaks last name	80	first name	86%
"This is a block."	64	Uses affirmative and negative statements:		last name	83
"This is not a block."	32	This is a car.	71	Expresses self understandably in one or two simple, complete sentences	95
"It is a _____."	34	This is not a car.	57	Uses affirmative statement	82
"It is not a _____."	26	This is a _____."	62	Uses negative statement	68
Repeats a simple nursery rhyme in a group	81	This is not a _____."	52		
Sings a nursery rhyme or seasonal song in a group	87				
Reproduces animal sound in a group:		Identifies and reproduces animal sounds:			
dog	85	pig	30		
cat	79		60		
duck	69				
		Uses prepositions correctly:			
		Where is the ball?			
		The ball is under the chair.	77		
		The ball is on the chair	73		
		Uses courteous expressions (at snack?):			
		please	82		
		thank you	87		
				Asks question, understandably, in a complete sentence	91%
				Answers question, understandably, in a complete sentence	85
				Completes rhyme or parts of a simple familiar story in sequence	76

	2nd Checklist January 29, 1971 8 classes, 141 students	3rd Checklist March 26, 1971 8 classes, 148 students
Designates (magazine pictures):		
big one	77%	
little one	78	
tall one	65	
short one	65	
Recognizes own name (when written)		80%
Recognizes likenesses and differences (matching like, excluding different)		
letters		62
numerals		57
pictures		66
Distinguishes between sizes of pictured things		
cat, kitten		70
dog, puppy		76
Turns pages of book properly		72
Recognizes seasonal change — winter to summer (spring)		
temperature		54
vegetation		27
precipitation		64

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONCEPTS

1st Checklist November 30, 1970 8 classes, 148 students		2nd Checklist January 29, 1971 8 classes, 141 students		3rd Checklist March 26, 1971 8 classes, 148 students	
In an array points to:		Select from an array:		Recognizes and names:	
red	75%	red	72%	red	86%
yellow	55	yellow	64	yellow	83
orange	65	orange	67	orange	85
black	74	blue	59	blue	79
		green	62	green	83
Recognizes shapes:		Recognizes and names:		Recognizes and names:	
circle	83	circle	87		
square	61	square	69	square	83
		triangle	67	triangle	74
				rectangle	51
In free play situation, distinguishes between:		In free play distinguishes between:		Distinguishes between:	
big and little	81	big and little	77		
tall and short	61	tall and short	70	tall and short	84
		large and small	55	large and small	75
				big, bigger, biggest	59
In free play situation, indicates position:		In circle indicates positions:		Indicates position:	
in	62	in and out	75	in and out	85
out	61	up and down	86	on and off	79
up	70	behind	70	back and forth	63
down	70			over and under	72
				top and bottom	76
Indicates order:		In line indicates:		Identifies position of object in group:	
first	57	first	80	first	83
last	52	last	52	last	80
				middle	68

CONCEPTS (continued)

1st Checklist November 30, 1970 8 classes, 148 students		2nd Checklist January 29, 1971 8 classes, 141 students		3rd Checklist March 26, 1971 8 classes, 148 students	
Recognizes quantity:		Indicates quantity:		Counts objects:	
1	82%	1	76%	1-5	82%
2	76	2	76	6-8	64
3	64	3	67		
		4	60	One to one correspondences	
		Recognizes numeral:		1-5	61
		1	66	6-8	38
		2	57		
		3	56		
		4	52		
		5	50		
		Recognizes letters:		Recognizes letters:	
		A	41	A-D	51
		B	35	E-G	28
		C	32		
		D	28	Repeats letters:	
				A-D	85
				E-G	73
Names classifications:		Names classifications:		Names classifications:	
family members (own or other)	57		82	pets — dog, cat, bird	67
pet animals	51		65	farm animals	59
				foods — meat, vegetables, fruits	61
				texture — rough, smooth, sticky, hard	72
				taste — sweet, sour, salty	75

A-13

157

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	2nd Checklist January 29, 1971 8 classes, 141 students	3rd Checklist March 26, 1971 8 classes, 148 students
Chooses own free play activity	91%	
Answers questions in circle discussions	87	
Asks questions in circle discussions		83%
Demonstrates creative ability — verbally, artistically, etc.		84

1st Checklist November 30, 1970 8 classes, 148 students		2nd Checklist January 29, 1971 8 classes, 141 students		3rd Checklist March 26, 1971 8 classes, 148 students	
Knows own age (in years)	55%		78%		
Points to body part:		Points to body part:			
arm	95				
leg	95				
head	95				
shoulder	87		86		
foot	95				
hand	94				
		elbow	70	Elbow	92%
		knee	84		
		ankle	58	Ankle	82
		neck	82		
		stomach	81		
Makes faces:		Makes faces:			
happy	66		84		
sad	63		72		
		angry	57		
				Knows own address	50
				Names people with whom he lives	89
				Names adults in the classroom	90
				Knows function of five senses:	
				eyes	68
				nose	61
				ears	64
				hands	61
				tongue	54
Works in a group (parallel)	79			Takes turns	72
Plays in a group (coordinated)	81			Puts materials away	73

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PSYCHO-MOTOR

1st Checklist November 30, 1970 8 classes, 148 students		2nd Checklist January 29, 1971 8 classes, 141 students		3rd Checklist March 26, 1971 8 classes, 148 students	
Develops control of body:		Develops control of body:		Develops control of body:	
walks across the room	86%				
runs length of yard or gym	76				
picks up and puts down:					
crayon	91				
child's chair	89				
		climbs	89		
				moves through space — hop, jump, bend, twist, pull, stretch	87%
				walks backward	81
				stands on one foot for five seconds	61
				steps over objects of various heights	83
				rides tricycle	87
				Handles ball:	
				throw and catch	91
				bounce and catch	81
Develops eye-hand coordination:		Develops eye-hand coordination:			
cut 8x10 paper with scissors	53			Cuts a straight line with scissors	81
color with crayons	82		74		
stack 3 blocks	76	paints with brush	93		
string 3 or more beads	79				
complete 4-6 piece puzzle	73				
Participated in:					
rhythmic activity	94			Draws a person	81
		Uses body for creative expression:			
		dancing	74		
		marching	78		

A-16
160

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

FIRST AND SECOND INTERIM CHECKLIST ITEMS AND AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF ATTAINMENT — SAMPLE MONTESSORI CLASSES

First and Second Interim Checklist Items and
Average Percentage of Attainment - Sample Montessori Classes

LANGUAGE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1st Checklist January, 1971 2 Classes, 29 Students	2nd Checklist March, 1971 2 Classes, 30 Students
Attends and gives full name	100%	
Follows simple direction	100	
"stand up"	100	
"bring me"	100	
Listens to entire poem or story & able to repeat all or parts of it	59	
Understands affirmative and negative	93	
Listens to others talk	100	
Able to answer questions	79	100
Able to contribute several sentences in group assembly. Discussions on room, home, food, immediate nature, etc.	59	90
.e to name objects		
In room	100	
In home & Family members	55	100
Immediate nature		
Plants	66	53
Trees	76	Trees - 2 kinds 53
Flowers	66	Flowers - 2 or 3 kinds 57
Grass	100	
Animals	100	
Geography		
Water	90	
Land	90	
Earth	48	100
Rock	---	100
Lakes	---	47
Rivers	---	30
Weather and climatic conditions	90	
Classes of foods		
Kinds of vegetables	100	
Kinds of fruit	100	
Kinds of meat	52	100
Hot foods	69	100
Cold foods	79	100
Seasons & holidays		
Spring, summer, fall, winter	---	
Halloween, Thanksgiving	100	

1st Checklist Januar , 1971 2 Classes, 29 Students		2nd Checklist March, 1971 2 Classes, 30 Students	
Knowledge of community helpers and their functions. fireman, milk an, nurse, doctor, dentist, painter, teacher, baker, plus other commonly known helpers	100%		
Verbally identify: colors		Verbally identify: colors	
red	90		
blue	90		
yellow	66		100%
		green	83
		orange	100
		purple	83
		brown	90
Forms			
Circle	93		
Square	72		
Triangle	66		
		Forms	
		triangle	100
		rectangle	100
		ovoid	10
		trapazoid	10
Dimensions		Dimensions - without blindfold	
Big - small	100		
Broad - narrow	93		100
Long - short	38		100
Tall - short	76		100
Sound			
Loud - soft	93		
Texture			
Rought - smooth	100		
Able to hold correctly, pencil, chalk and crayon to form straight & curved line & form very simple shapes	79		100
Able to fill in a shape but still gets outside line of form	90		
Can help break simple words into component sounds verbally	76		47
Can contribute rhyming words	55		
		Can break simple words into component sounds verbally	43
		Knows 5 to 10 sounds	53

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1st Checklist January, 1971 2 Classes, 29 Students		2nd Checklist March, 1971 2 Classes, 30 Students
		Knows 5 to 10 beginning sounds	53%
		Can match picture and beginning sound	53
		Can build simple words	30
		Can contribute rhyming words	93
Can repeat verbally individual letter sounds voiced by teacher	72%		100
Understanding of opposites			
behind - in front	100		
in - out	100		
before - after	45		100
on	100		
dark - light	100		
happy - sad	97		
up - down	100		
fast - slow	100		
walk - run	100		
beginning - end	55		100
first - last	45		100
PSYCHOMOTOR			
Develops control of body:			
walks across the room	100		
runs length of yard or gym	55		100
picks up and puts down objects	100	walks on line around circle	100
kicks ball	100	walks on line carrying object around circle	100
climbs	---		100
Hits nail with hammer	---		---
Puts needle in/out of cloth	66		100
Uses brush & pan-clean up	100	Sews on buttons	90
Dusts shelves & furniture	59		100
Places object on shelf	100	Polishes shoes	100
Carries chair	100	Able to follow & cut on a line straight or curved	77
Carries tray	100	Can paste cut shape on paper	100
Polishes mirror	100	Can stack 10 cubes - without blindfold	100
Washes hands	100	Can string 10-12 small beads	100
Brushes hair	---		
Scissors	100		
Stack 3 blocks	100		
String 3 or more beads	100		

	1st Checklist January, 1971 2 Classes, 29 Students	2nd Checklist March, 1971 2 Classes, 30 Students
Complete 4-6 piece puzzle	100%	
Can grip with thumb and forefinger instead of all fingers or prehensil grasp	100	
Touch and handle items with some degree of lightness	79	
CONCEPTS		
Match primary colors in array of colors	100	
Match like forms in array of forms		
circles	100	100%
squares	100	100
equilateral triangles	45	100
rectangles	55	100
ovals	---	47
spheres	---	100
cubes	---	100
cylinders	---	100
Match like forms - with blindfold		
circles		100
squares		100
equilateral triangles		100
rectangles		100
ovals		83
spheres		100
cubes		100
cylinders		100
Discriminate dimensions		
big & small	100	
broad & narrow	97	100
long & short	100	
Match pictures, objects, & designed fabric	100	
Match like textures such as very smooth or very rough	55	100
Match very contrasting nuts & objects by feel only	100	
Match like musical tones on bells	59	70
Match common environmental sounds	100	
Can recognize higher & lower tones		80

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1st Checklist January, 1971 2 Classes, 29 Students	2nd Checklist March, 1971 2 Classes, 30 Students
Participated in rhythmic activity	100%	
Participation in rhythm band		100%
Identify common tastes and match:		
Salty (salt)	55	100
sweet (sugar)	55	100
sour (vinegar	---	100
tart (lemon)	---	---
spicy (cinnamon)	---	---
hot (pepper)	---	---
Identify common foods	100	
Identify some common flower scents	---	---
Match very strong smells such as perfume as opposed to garlic	---	100
Number:		
Quantity 1 - 5	62	100
Symbols 1 - 5	69	100
Sequence 1 - 5	52	83
Quantity 6 - 10		57
Symbols 6 - 10		57
SELF CONCEPT		Quantity 6 - 10 13
Able to wait turn in group discussion	86	
Being aware of body's need to:		
pass around objects	83	
sit quietly	59	87
Need of self to appear pleasant by chewing, drinking, and handling utensils quietly while eating	76	
Need of self to appear pleasant by chewing, drinking, & handling utensil quietly while eating		100
Respect for other peoples person and possessions	86	97
Knows own age (in years)	100	
Knows body parts		
arm	100	
leg	100	
head	100	
houlder	100	
foot	100	
hand	100	
Knows body parts		
hand		100
eye		100
neck		100
elbow		100
knee		100
back		100
chest		100
ankle		100

	1st Checklist January, 1971 2 Classes, 29 Students	2nd Checklist March, 1971 2 Classes, 30 Students
		wrist 100%
CHARACTER & PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT		
Can pick work spontaneously rather than adult imposed 24 weeks - 50% of classtime	100%	97
Is able to pick constructively 24 weeks - 50% of classtime	83	93
Is occupied with work during classtime 24 weeks - 75% of classtime	97	87
Is constructively observing other children & their work if not engaged in an activity himself	72	87
Is able to work alone 24 weeks - good	66	100
		Is able to work with teacher & other children when asked 100
Is willing to work alone rather than depend on adult or other children	72	100
Can work with one piece of apparatus, procedure or activity 24 week to 40 minutes	45	73
Can work at chosen or given task until completed 24 weeks - 90% of time	55	87
Able to focus complete attention on teachers demonstration	59	33
Able to focus attention on own work	76	90
Willing to repeat exercises or activities until skill is gained	55	73
Repeats exercises at self-direction rather than adult suggestion	69	80

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1st Checklist January, 1971 2 Classes, 29 Students	2nd Checklist March, 1971 2 Classes, 30 Students
Able to observe then follow through sequential steps of operation	100%	100%
Notices detail in activities	38	67
Is precise in following procedure of activity 24 weeks - 50% of time	59	30
Shows preciseness in handling of apparatus or materials 24 weeks - good	62	77
Does not interfere with others possessions 24 weeks - 75% of time	62	90
Does not interfere in others activities 24 weeks - 75% of time	66	100
Keep hands off of others 24 Weeks - 75% of time	66	73
Offers to help others in clean up of accidents or if asked to help in clean up of activity 24 weeks - 75% of time	100	100
Helpful to others if having difficulty or not understanding materials	59	60
Imposes own self-discipline in group	41	77
Can sit still for group work 24 weeks - 20 minutes	93	100
Willing to wait turn	100	100
Willing to respond to request	52	100
Returns material to shelf in clean orderly condition 24 weeks - 75% of time	55	80
ices if material or room is out of order	86	100
Voluntarily puts shelves and room in order	62	90

APPENDIX E

PROSE CATEGORIES

This appendix provides a brief description of the kinds of activities, events, or conditions which are coded by observers in preschool classrooms with the Personal Record of School Experience.

Relevance of PROSE Categories to Objectives of
Early Childhood Education/Head Start Program

Active Conditions

Interaction with adults:

1. Child's activity

   initiates, star (one to one), participates, listens and watches

2. To or with whom:

   teacher, aide, observer, other

3. Adult's response

   positive, permits, shows and tells, listens quietly, does for, controls, negative

4. (6) Nature of contact

   physical, materials, verbal

5. (7) Sex/Race Elements

   other sex other group, other sex same group, same sex other group, same sex some group

6. (8) Child's concentration level

   cooperative, distracted, resistant, work on other activity, disruptive

7. (9) Child's activity level

   high with locomotion, moderate with locomotion, high no locomotion, moderate no locomotion, low

8. (11) Overall tone of interaction

   positive, negative

Items 4(6) and 8(11) would not be completed when non-relevant; i.e., no contact and interaction essentially neutral.

Interaction with peers

1. (4) Observed child's role

   aggressive action, initiates, cooperates, withdraws, resists

2. (5) Observed child's peer

   aggressive action, initiates, cooperates, withdraws, resists

3. (6) Nature of contact

   physical, material, verbal

4. (7) Sex/Race elements

   other sex other group, other sex same group, same sex other group, same sex same group

5. (9) Child's activity level

   high with locomotion, moderate with locomotion, high no locomotion, moderate no locomotion, low

6. (10) Child's activity

   fantasy, divergent (self, only), convergent, work, kinesthetic

7. (11) Overall tone of interaction

   positive to negative

Items 3(6) and 7(11) would not be completed when non-relevant.

Individual activity

1. (8) Child's concentration level

   cooperative, distracted, resistent, works on other, disruptive

2. (9) Child's activity level

   high with locomotion, moderate with locomotion, high no locomotion, moderate no locomotion, low.

3. (10) Child's activity

   fantasy, divergent, convergent, work, kinesthetic

4. (11) Overall tone of observation

   positive, negative

Item 4(11) would not be completed when non-relevant.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Static Conditions

1. Instructional Area

   Arithmetic, arts and crafts, exercise/games, free play, health/hygiene, language, music/rhythms, rest/nutrition, science, sensory (color), social skills, social studies

2. Role of adult

   Show, tell, lead, discuss, peer, manage, supervise, resource, housekeeping, individual attention (to other), listen/watch, no contact (not available)

3. Physical relationship of observed to adult

   Next, near, middle of group, fringe, outside

4. Size of group

   one, two, 3-5, 6+, all

5. Room atmosphere

   Attentive excited, attentive tense, noisy excited, noisy busy, quiet busy, quiet idle

6. Specific behaviors of observed

   Used numbers, used words, sang or talked to self, helped peer, comforted peer, showed affection for peer, asked peer for help, received help/affection, rejected by group, has accident or is hurt, showed fear, cried, lost temper, tattled, led peer, bossed peer, wrecked something, refused help, resisted adult, disobeyed, showed hostility to adult, ridiculed by adult, used as bad example, used as good example, performed chore/errand, showed affection for adult, waited turn.

7. Specific behaviors of Teacher

   Called for quiet, threatened, lost temper, laughed with children, used physical restraint

8. Materials used and site of observed activity

   (Materials and site)

   Art (paint, clay), craft, musical instrument, books/writing, puzzles/quiet games, blocks, wheel toys, tools/work bench, sand, gym/exercise, clothes/jewelry, food/water, dolls, homemaking, cleanup tools, audio-visual device, special instructional device, science equipment

   (Site only)

   Assigned seat, teacher's desk, open area, toilet, playground, out of room

Items 6 and 7 would not be marked if non-relevant.

APPENDIX F

INTERCODER RELIABILITY ON P.R.O.S.E.

Reliability studies were conducted during the first and second observation periods for this study. The material in Appendix F discusses the results of these reliability checks.

INTERCODER RELIABILITY ON P.R.O.S.E.

In selecting an appropriate method for computing inter-coder reliability on the PROSE, several characteristics of this observational tool had to be considered.

1. The eleven dimensions or areas to be coded (Side One, the Active side) were comprised of varying numbers of categories ranging from two to eight.

2. Certain areas were infrequently rated, and certain categories in certain areas were infrequently used.

Because of these characteristics a simple percentage agreement between raters in coding observations into categories was not considered adequate.

This was primarily because in some dimensions with two or three categories, percentage agreement would tend to be high, in other dimensions involving six or seven categories would tend to be low. Likewise, in certain areas where there were several categories but only one or two were used, the percentage of agreement would tend to be high.

With these considerations in mind, several methods of computing reliability were reviewed for their applicability. These included Flanders' Interaction Matrix, Cohen's Kappa (K) coefficient of agreement and Scott's Index of intercoder agreement.

Kentall's coefficient of concordance (W) was also suggested as a possible method because it was somewhat less restrictive. However, the PROSE data generated in our reliability study did not seem to lend itself to this method because of the number of ties for which corrections would need to be made as well as the fact that a separate W would have to be computed for each sub-category within each of the eleven areas and a number of these sub-categories were infrequently used by observers.

For this initial reliability study it was felt that either the (K) or Scott's Index of coder agreement were methods lending themselves to PROSE data on the Active side. These data were assumed to meet the requirements that (1) the units were independent, (2) the categories were independent, mutually exclusive, and (3) the observers operated independently.

The Kappa was employed because it took into consideration the number of sub-categories used by coder in any one area and based chance agreement for any category on the marginal totals for each category. It differed from Scott's index in not assuming a known distribution of proportions over the categories for the population which is taken to be equal for the judges. The coefficient K represents the proportion of agreements after chance agreement is removed from consideration, i.e.

$K = \frac{Po - Pc}{1 - Pc}$ where Po = observed proportion of agreement; Pc = proportion of agreement by chance; and N = total set of codings for that dimension, or in frequency terms, $K = \frac{fo - fc}{N - fc}$.

In Table 1 the K's computed for PROSE items and an additional dimension designated "Personal Locus of Activity" are given. This latter dimension was comprised of mutually exclusive categories on the PROSE and included child-adult, child-child and child-alone categories.

Table 1 (Intercoder Reliability on the PROSE) gives the coefficients of agreement between pairs of observers from a study conducted to determine inter-rater agreement on codings. Each observer was paired with each of the other obs. vers in observing children in non-sample classrooms and coding PROSE categories. Paired records of observation for each of seven preschool children were

obtained for each set of observers, and Kappa coefficients were computed for items on the Active side of the PROSE record. These data render "1st Reliability. This study was repeated at the beginning of the current observation period (February 1971) permitting comparison between November and February indices of agreement and work is continuing on determining adequate indices of reliability for context codings. Data on only three pairs were available at this time. They are under "2nd Reliability" in Table 1.

Table 1

INTERCODER RELIABILITY ON THE PROSE

PROSE Active Categories Items (Words)	Kappa Coefficients of Agreement *										
	Observer Pairs, 1st Reliability[a]							Observer Pairs, 2nd Reliability[b]			
	(Av.K.)	GH	GL	GR	HL	HR	LR	(Av.K.)	HL	HR	LR
1. Adult-child	(.54)	.63	.29	.88	.69	.77	.66	(.92)	.83	.92	.90
2. Adult role	(.68)	.71	.28	.88	.72	.80	.68	(.86)	.84	.94	.80
3. Adult resp.	(.53)	.26	.22	.56	.46	.73	.94	(.87)	.79	.94	.89
4. Child-peer	(Only a few codings were assigned by observers — blank agreements ranged from 90 to 98%)										
5. Peer-child											
6. Nature of contact	(.61)	.46	.33	.69	.90	.71	.59	(.71)	.85	.57	.71
7. Sex-ethnic	(.74)	.79	.39	.88	.84	.55	.86	(.90)	.89	.87	.95
8. Appropriateness of response	(Only one category used primarily — 80 to 90% agreement in assigning coding to one category — "cooperation.")										
9. Activity and locomotion	(.19)	.02	.15	.30	.30	.20	.20	(.23)	.41	.04	.23
10. Use of material	(.66)	.84	.23	.76	(blank)	.63	.86		(blank)	(blank)	.84
11. Affective level	(85 to 100% agreement in leaving blank.)							(100% agreement in leaving blank.)			
Personal locus of activity#	(.66)	.70	.33	1.00	.31	.87	.73	(.89)	.92	.85	.90

#Includes three categories: adult-child, peer-child, child-alone.

a. Includes four observers.

b. Includes three observers.

*"A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales," Jacob Cohen, New York University, Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 20, No. 1, 1960.

APPENDIX G

INSTRUMENT DESCRIPTION

A brief description is provided for each of the instruments used in this study for assessing change in student performance.

Name of measure: The Preschool Inventory (Caldwell)

Purpose and application of test: The Preschool Inventory as currently used provides a global index of cognirive abflity or development by sampling a variety of cognitive skills, including knowledge of body parts, colors, shapes, position, social function, quantity, directions and so forth. It is not a culture-fair test and was not intended to be. The authors see its use as permitting educators to see clearly the degree of disadvantage the child from deprived backgrounds has at the time of entry into public school. One of the major objectives in constructing the inventory was to develop an instrument sensitive to experience and thus one that would demonstrate change associated with educational intervention.

Validity and reliability: This test is considered to be highly reliable and test-retest correlation coefficients range from .80 to .89. Its validity is indicated by significantly positive correlations with other well-established cognitive measures. Correlations of .73 and higher are reported with the Stanford-Binet. Although the measure is not a highly standardized instrument, national norms are now available. In the fall of 1968 children were tested in over 150 Head Start centers across the country. The results for 1,531 children grouped by age are included in the following table:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

National Norms for Caldwell Preschool Inventory

N=1,531 children*

Age Groups	(N)	Mean Score	S.D.
3 years - 3 years, 11 months	158	25.6	9.8
4 yrs - 4 yrs, 5 mos	528	30.0	10.1
4 yrs, 6 mos - 4 yrs, 11 mos	438	33.9	10.5
5 yrs - 5 yrs, 5 mos	259	38.4	10.1
5 yrs, 6 mos - 6 yrs, 5 mos	148	42.4	11.0

*Children tested in over 150 Head Start classes throughout the United States in fall 1969. 68.2% Negro, 37.8 other (16.3% white, 6% Mexican-American, 5.1% Polynesian, 4.7% Puerto Ricans, Orientals, American Indians, Eskimos) (New England N=429, South East N=155, Plains N=107, Far West N=269).

History of use and current status: The Caldwell is perhaps the most widely used preschool instrument. It has undergone revision several times. The current experimental edition, 1968, has sixty-four items in contrast to the first which had 161 items and the second edition which had eighty-five. In its original form, the measure had four subscores. These represented items in four sub-tests originally derived through a factor analysis. These four sub-tests provided scores on numerical and sensory concepts and personal-social responsiveness and associated vocabulary. In its present reduced form these sub scores have been eliminated. Thus its diagnostic usefulness has been somewhat reduced, although the validity of these sub-test scores had not been amply demonstrated.

The Caldwell Preschool Inventory is widely accepted by evaluators and early childhood educators and is being used in national studies by Stanford Research Institute and Educational Testing Service. It was selected for the Kansas City evaluation of Model Cities Early Childhood Education program for the following reasons: (1) The test had an adequate development and was accepted by Early Childhood Education people. (2) It was

Name of test: Motor Inhibition Test — Educational Testing Service

Purpose and application: The measure is highly experimental. Its purpose presumably is to measure the child's ability to consciously inhibit motor movement, an ability considered significantly associated with school adjustment and school success. Various measures of motor inhibition have been used by various investigators. Typically, the measure involves the child doing a simple motor task naturally and then on request doing it as slowly as he can. In the Maccoby Motor Inhibition Test, copyrighted in 1969 by the Educational Testing Service, an attempt has been made to standardize the motor inhibition task and its administration, thus permitting some cross-study comparisons and the building up of normative data. The test manual for the 1969 edition consists of two different tasks, one of which is requesting the child to walk a simulated sidewalk which is a board or tape laid on the floor six feet in length and five inches wide. The tester first walks the board as an example for the child. The child is then asked to walk the board. The child is then asked to walk the board as slowly as he can. The time required is recorded by a stopwatch. The second task is to have the child draw a line from one horizontal (telephone pole) to another horizontal line (telephone pole) on the same page. He is then asked to do this as slowly as possible. The slow time in both cases represents his score on this Maccoby Motor Inhibition Test.

Reliability and validity: The ability to consciously control motor behavior is considered to have some association with problem solving and significantly positive correlations between the Stanford-Binet and scores on inhibition tests are reported in the literature. Fair reliability has also been indicated in studies of motor inhibition. Correlations of .39 in test-retest over a period of several weeks have been reported. However, there has been no validity or reliability data presented on the Maccoby Motor Inhibition Test and the test continues to be varied somewhat in its administration from program to program.

Use with inner-city preschool children: This measure is currently being used in Follow-Through evaluations of the Head Start programs. Tor Meeland, with Stanford

Research Institute, is presently using the instrument and modifying its format. In a personal communication, Meeland indicated that they are now administering the measure first requesting the child to do the task as fast as he can and then as slow as he can, so that the child's understanding of fast and slow is indicated. This suggests a considerable improvement over the instructions in the 1969 manual for test administration.

Although the administration of the measure has not been standardized as yet, a number of people working in the field consider the motor inhibition test as having potential value. It is a very simple test to administer, children seem to like it, and it does provide a measure which appears to have some association with measures predicting success in school. Some investigators have found that the Motor Inhibition Test may reflect nothing other than the willingness of the subject to tolerate the testing situation.

The on-going research with the Maccoby suggests a very important need for evaluators to be aware of current findings and modifications in test administrations. Personal communication with Tor Meeland suggested a much improved procedure for administering this instrument. However, since the pretesting in the Kansas City Evaluation Program had already been accomplished, any modifications or improvement in administration cannot be introduced in the post-testing, since of course the test conditions would not be comparable.

Name of test: The Preposition Inventory — Institute for Developmental Studies

Purpose and application of the measure: The Preposition Inventory is another one of the tests developed for the Early Childhood Inventory (ECI) series at the Institute for Developmental Studies. This measure, individually administered, is designed to evaluate the child's ability to recognize the use of 16 prepositions, including:against, among, around, away from, behind, between, beside, in, in front of, on, over, through, toward, up and under. The child is presented with 16 cards, each comprised of four pictures and is asked to point to the picture representing the preposition named by the administrator. The 16 cards are so designed that each can be used to evaluate at least two different prepositions so that the Preposition Inventory has equivalent forms useful for retesting, and also permitting evaluation of guessing and positional response set behaviors.

Validity and reliability: Although there has been much data accumulated using the Preposition Inventory, there has yet been very little analysis of the data and normative data are not available.In the Kansas City pretest evaluation of the Model Cities program, a reliability coefficient of .69 was obtained for 21 children over an interval of approximately 3 weeks.

Use with inner-city preschoolers: Development of the ECI, including the Preposition Inventory, was based on the fact that measures of cognitive functioning needed to be interesting as well as appropriate for socially disadvantaged children. A major focus in constructing this measure was to make it a fair test for the disadvantaged. Most of the pilot and standardization work that has been done with this measure has been with urban disadvantaged Negro children. The test has considerable relevance to the Early Childhood Education program in Kansas City, Missouri. Considerable emphasis in the early stages of program development and specifying of objectives was the need to improve disadvantaged preschoolers concepts of position.

Use by people in the field: Although little normative data are available, the ECI Inventory, including the Preposition Inventory, has been developed by competent early childhood education researchers. It is presently being used in a number of studies throughout the country so that comparative normative data will soon be available.

Administration and qualification of the tester: The Preposition Inventory was developed to provide an easily administered and easily scored measure appropriate for socially disadvantaged children. It requires only a few minutes to administer, and no special skills other than the ability to establish rapport with the child and observe and accurately record his responses.

The Children's Auditory Discrimination Inventory — UCLA

Purpose and application: The purpose of this measure is to focus specifically on auditory discrimination. It was constructed to minimize the influence of general linguistic skills and vocabulary on the child's response to the test. In substance, the authors attempted to remove knowledge of words from the discrimination task. In this test the child is presented with a card with two illustrations; one depicts discrete objects, the other nonsense line drawings. The examiner names each of the illustrations utilizing the "real" word and a nonsense word and then requests that the child designate one or the other, depending on the word the examiner repeats. There are 38 such cards with equal distribution left and right location and word repeated of sense and nonsense words.

Validity and reliability: The test is in two forms, A and B, using the same set of items. Form B is the same as A, except that the child is asked to select the alternative one of each pair. Test-retest reliability was made on 153 children receiving both Form A and Form B in random order. The inter-form reliability (Spearman-Brown correction) was .87. The internal reliability (K-R 20) of the two forms was .71 for Form A and .74 for Form B. Concerning the validity of the measure, the authors point out that the relationship between auditory and visual discrimination and the acquisition of reading skills such as letter and word recognition, is still far from clear. Mean scores of children grouped at six-month age intervals starting at three years consistently increase with each age grouping. Additionally, studies show a highly significant difference in auditory discrimination scores attributable to age and socioeconomic status but no reliable main effect for race or sex. Differences between ethnic groups is far less than those for socioeconomic status.

The test was standardized using a total of 476 children, about half receiving Form A and half Form B. The group of 476 children were comprised of slightly more girls than boys and included 158 Caucasian and 308 Negro children. One hundred twenty-four

children were from middle and 352 children were from low socioeconomic status groups. In this population were 140 three-year-olds, 217 four-year-olds, and 119 five-year-olds.

Use with inner-city preschool children: All the children used in the standardization of this test were drawn from a large metropolitan setting and were in attendance at either a nursery school, children's center or Head Start class. Currently, the measure is being used in a number of project evaluations of inner-city early childhood education programs.

Current status of the test: At the present time, the usefulness of this measure is not clear. However, it is one of the few well-constructed auditory discrimination tasks for this early childhood age group. It was well-researched and carefully constructed by competent individuals in early childhood evaluation and research. Several large-scale longitudinal studies are now including the auditory inventory in their test battery which should result in a rich data pool from which answers concerning ethnic and class differences and auditory perception may be forthcoming.

Administration and qualifications of tester: The auditory discrimination inventory is easy to administer, taking approximately ten to twelve minutes per child. It is, of course, individually administered, easily scored and can be administered by lay people and paraprofessionals with workshop training.

Name of test: The Brown Self-Concept Referents Test — Institute for Developmental Studies

Purpose and application: The intent of this measure is to gain some information about how a child perceives himself. First a Polaroid snapshot is made of the child and then he is asked questions about the child in the picture. The questions range from simple identification to whether the child is usually happy, clean, healthy, etc. There are fifteen questions such as these with pre-determined positive response. A score of fifteen indicates the highest possible number of positive responses the child could make.

Validity and reliability: Although a number of investigators have used this instrument, information concerning its validity and reliability is very limited, as is frequently the case with measures of affective or personality characteristics, but particularly so with preschoolers. A number of investigators with considerable background in early childhood education, including Nimnicht, have used this test in their studies. In personal correspondence, Nimnicht has raised some questions about the validity of the responses to the self-referrent questions and is working on a modification of the measure. In the Kansas City pretesting, a test-retest administration of the measure to twenty-one preschoolers resulted in a reliability coefficient of .75, based on approximately a 2 week interval between tests. We also obtained some distribution of scores, i.e., scores were not all at the positive end of the scale, although this was the general tendency. The mean range of pretest scores for ten preschool classes comprising approximately fifteen children per class was 10.7 to 12.0, with a total group mean of 11.5.

Use of the Brown Self-Referrent Test with inner-city preschoolers: As indicated, the measure is being used presently in a number of project evaluation studies of inner-city preschool children and normative comparison data should soon be available. However, our experience with the measure and its administration, suggests it may be subject

to variability in test administration, since a standardized administration seems to be somewhat difficult to maintain. Some of the words used in the questions to children may also affect the child's responses in ways not anticipated. For example, questions such as "Is he smart or is he stupid?" have been questioned by our testers. One tester suggested that "smart" is often used in the homes in a derogatory sense, that is, children often hear, "Don't smart off," or "You're a 'smart' aleck." These interpretations of the word might result its being rejected for the less familiar word "stupid" and this would be scored a negative response. Other semantic problems in this test may influence inner-city children's responses and need to be investigated. Also, there are questions concerning the arbitrary scoring of responses to certain questions as negative rather than positive. However, in view of the relatively high reliability coefficient obtained in our study, and most importantly, the response of the children to the test itself which was one of considerable interest and enjoyment, the incentive characteristics of the test have much to offer as part of a test battery. We also encouraged testers to note children's extra test responses and spontaneous reactions.

Qualifications for administering: The test is a relatively costly one in view of the need for Polaroid cameras and film, but it is relatively simple to administer and can be done by paraprofessionals with some workshop training.

Name of test: The Numeral Name Inventory — Institute for Developmental Studies

Purpose and application of the measure: The Numeral Name Inventory is one of the tests developed for the Early Childhood Inventory (ECI) series in on-going research at the Institute for Developmental Studies in New York. This specific measure is an inaividually administered inventory designed to evaluate a child's ability to identify twenty common numbers from 0 to 19; it consists of two separate nonverbal and verbal tasks. In the nonverbal task, the child is presented with twenty arrays of four numbers each and is asked to point to specific numbers present in the arrays, as they are named by the administrator. In the verbal task the child is presented each number one at a time and asked to "Name it." The nonverbal is administered first, followed by the verbal task.

Validity and reliability: Although much data have been accumulated using the ECI and the Numeral Name Inventory in particular, there has as yet been very little analysis of the data. In personal communication, Jack Victor (Director of the Early Childhood Inventory Project), reports a reliability coefficient of .81, between alternate forms (non-verbal only) of the Numeral Name Inventory (pretest data only).

Use with inner-city preschoolers: The development of the ECI including Numeral Naming was based on the fact that measures of cognitive functioning needed to be interesting as well as appropriate for socially disadvantaged children. The major focus in constructing this measure was to make it a fair test for the disadvantaged and the researchers state that most of their pilot and standardization work has been done with urban disadvantaged Negro children.

Use by people in the field: Although relatively little normative data are available on this test, it has been developed by competent early childhood education researchers and is presently being used in a number of studies, including Planned Variation and Follow-Through so that comparative and normative data should soon be available.

Administration and qualifications of the tester: The Numeral Name Inventory was developed out of a need for an easily administered and easily scored measure appropriate for socially disadvantaged children. It requires only a few minutes to administer and no special skills other than the ability to establish rapport with the child and observe and accurately record his responses.

Name of test: The Alphabet Name Inventory — Institute for Developmental Studies

Purpose and application of the measure: The Alphabet Name Inventory is one of the tests developed for the Early Childhood Inventory (ECI) series in the research going on at the Institute for Developmental Studies in New York. This specific measure is individually administered and designed to evaluate a child's ability to identify 26 upper case letters of the alphabet. It consists of two separate tasks, a nonverbal and a verbal task. In the nonverbal task, the child is presented with 26 arrays of four letters each and is asked to point to specific letters present in each array as they are named by the administrator. The first 13 letters asked for are those occurring most frequently in words typically used in teaching initial reading and spelling skills. Each array contains two relatively high frequency letters and two relatively low frequency letters. In the verbal task, each letter is presented to the child one at a time and he is asked to name it. The nonverbal task is presented first, followed by the verbal.

Validity and reliability: Although much data have been accumulated using the ECI and the Alphabet Name Inventory in particular, there has as yet been very little analysis of the data. In personal communication, Jack Victor (Director of the Early Childhood Inventory Project) reports a reliability coefficient of .84 between alternate forms (nonverbal only) of the Alphabet Name Inventory with prekindergarten children using pretest data only.

Use with inner-city preschoolers: The development of the ECI, including Alphabet Naming, was based on the fact that measures of cognitive functioning needed to be interesting as well as appropriate for socially disadvantaged children. A major focus constructing this measure was to make it a fair test for the disadvantaged. The researchers state that most of their pilot and standardization work has been done with urban disadvantaged Negro children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Use by people in the field: Although little normative data are available, the ECI inventory, including Alphabet Naming, has been developed by competent early childhood education researchers. It is presently being used in a number of studies including Planned Variation and Follow-Through so that comparative normative data will soon be available.

Administration and qualification of the tester: The Alphabet Name Inventory was developed out of the need for an easily administered and easily scored measure appropriate for socially disadvantaged children. It requires only a few minutes to administer and no special skills other than the ability to establish rapport with the child and to observe and accurately record his responses. The nonverbal is administered first, followed by the verbal task.

Name of test: TAMA General Knowledge Test II

Purpose and application of test: This test is designed to assess the general knowledge of children of preschool age. The child is presented with an array of three pictures, one of which depicts a scene or event asked about by the examiner. The child is to point to the correct picture. Some of the questions asked reflect the content of the instrument. Which letter is ready to mail? Which is most like the flag of our country? Which dog might bite? Which money will buy the most ice cream? There are 25 items.

Validity and reliability: Although this instrument has been under development for some time, no information on validity or reliability has been obtainable to this time.

Use with inner-city pupils: The instrument was being used by the Educational Testing Service with some of their evaluations of Head Start.

Use in the field: As above.

Administration and qualification of the testers: The TAMA General Knowledge Test II was developed to provide a measure of general knowledge which could be obtained by testers with limited training. The children are presented with three pictures on a card. The examiner reads a question and the child points to the picture which best answers the question. It is not necessary for the examiner to interpret or rate the response, merely to record the picture designated and indicate whether the response was correct or incorrect (this can be done at a later time with a list of correct answers). The test has been successfully administered by paraprofessionals and volunteers.

Name of test: California Preschool Social Competency Scale

Purpose and application: This is a teacher's rating scale which is assumed to measure interpersonal behavior and the degree to which children assume social responsibility. The measure consists of thirty items, each item representing samples of what are believed critical behaviors in the preschool child's social functioning. The critical behaviors relate essentially to the affective-social rather than cognitive areas of functioning. Such critical behaviors rated by teachers relate to response to routine, response to unfamiliar situations, following instructions, making explanations, sharing, helping others, initiating activities, giving direction to activities, reactions to frustration and accepting limits. The authors have attempted to describe specific behaviors which transcend the specific environment of the preschool and maintain that the behaviors described are common to a wide variety of programs. The content of each rating item is undimensional so that the four different levels within an item reflect different levels of competence for the same behavior.

Validity and reliability: Reliability of ratings on this scale from three different studies indicate fair inter-rater reliability between independent raters with correlations ranging from .76 to .79. Studies to determine the interaction of chronological age, sex and occupational level upon these social competency scores show that chronological age, sex and the occupational level of parent is significantly associated with them.

Normative data: Norms were based on teacher ratings of children with an age range from two years and six months through five years and six months who were attending preschool nursery school programs. The norming sample approximated the proportion of preschool children in the major urban centers for each geographical region of the United States and included the ratings of 800 children obtained in four different age groups with each age group divided into four norm groups by sex and occupational level of

parent. Thus, the social competency scale appears to have been carefully constructed with the manual providing norm tables on each of four chronological age groups stratified by sex and occupational level.

Use with inner-city preschoolers: As indicated above, this rating scale has been used in inner-city preschool classrooms and the normative data includes urban preschoolers.

History and current use: This measure is of recent development and is currently being widely used. The major reason is that it is one of only a few such measures that have been carefully constructed and that have adequate normative data. However, there are problems in its use. For example, to use this scale effectively, the rater needs to be familiar with the content areas covered, including the ordering of competency levels within each item; it is necessary that in rating a child on a particular item the rater must take into account a variety of contexts within which the behavior manifests itself.

Thus, the items are such that they require the rater to have had considerable opportunity to observe the child in a variety of situations. Using this measure as a pretest usually means that the teachers will have had only a three or four week period of observing the child prior to the first series of ratings. In our own experience in the Kansas City E.C.E. Evaluation, it was found that many teachers had questions or doubts about being able to rate some of their children on all of the items. The manual stresses, however, that each item must be rated so that teachers are forced to rate a child in areas where they feel uncertain. Some teachers complained that behaviors described in some items had not been expressed in the short time they had known the children. Others stated that a child was very quiet and the teacher had not observed this kind of behavior. Others simply stated that the child did not stand out at all in the

particular area and others would complain that a child was absent too much to rate. In spite of this, we encouraged teachers to rate all of the items, making educated guesses where necessary, but then to write on the rating form opposite the item any comments they might feel appropriate to alert us to the problem they were confronting.

Evaluators using this measure generally agree that it has usefulness but also see certain flaws and problems in its use. However, of all the imperfect rating scales, it appears to be relatively well accepted, perhaps because as one evaluator noted, "What else is there?"

Qualifications for administering the measure require that a lay person or teacher be familiar with the content areas covered in the scale and should have opportunity to observe the child to be rated for a period of time prior to rating. The time required for rating has been estimated from fifteen minutes to forty-five minutes per child. No special equipment other than the test protocol is required.

APPENDIX H

INSTRUMENTS USED WITH PARENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (ECE PROGRAM)

In order to provide the best possible for your little boy/girl we need to know as much about him/her as possible. Since you know more about him/her than anyone I would like to ask you a few questions:

What is his/her name? _____ Is that what you call him/her?_____.

1. What are some of the things that ( ) likes to do?

watch TV _____ color _____ other _____
play ball _____ look at books _____ _____

2. What are some things that ( ) doesn't like to do?

watch TV _____ eat _____ other _____
go to bed _____ sleep _____ _____

3. What foods does ( ) like best?

candy _____ ice cream _____ hamburgers _____
peanut butter _____ milk _____ other _____

4. What foods won't ( ) eat?

meat _____ milk _____ other _____
vegetables _____ _____

5. Is ( ) pretty healthy? yes _____ no _____

6. Well, what kinds of health problems has ( ) had?

colds _____ ear infections _____ other _____
accidents _____ hearing _____ _____
fevers _____ seeing _____ _____

7. Is ( ) usually happy?

8. What makes ( ) unhappy when he/she is?

other children _____ adults _____
certain activities _____ other _____

9. What makes him/her happy?

children _____ adults _____
gifts _____ other _____
foods _____ _____
certain activities _____ _____

10. Does ( ) run, jump, and play well or is he/she a little clumsy <u>in the house</u>?

coordinated _____ clumsy _____

11. How about outside?

coordinated _____ clumsy _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. Does ( ) get along well or is he/she a little shy?

with other children?	well _____	shy _____
with adults he/she knows	well _____	shy _____
with strangers	well _____	shy _____

13. Who does ( ) usually spend his/her time with?

mother _____	brothers and sisters _____	other _____
adults _____	other children _____	_____

14. Do you or someone else read or look at books with ( )? yes ____ no _____

15. Who does? _____ very often? _____

16. What kinds of places does ( ) go with you or others? (read alternatives if necessary)

store _____	park _____	other _____
downtown _____	visiting _____	_____
church _____	trips _____	_____

17. Why did you decide to enroll ( ) in pre-school? (encourage responses)

siblings in Head Start ___	social _____	other _____
academic _____	economic _____	_____

18. How do you think we at the pre-school can best help your child this year? (encourage responses)

academic _____	health _____	other _____
social _____	food _____	_____

19. How far did you have a chance to go in school?

less than 8th grade _____	8th grade _____
high school _____	beyond high school _____

To help us get started more quickly, can you tell us a few things about how he/she acts at home?
For example:

20. When you call ( ) does he/she usually come right away? yes _____ no _____

21. When you tell ( ) about something, do you usually have to explain how and why or is your first answer enough?

enough _____ not enough _____

22. When ( ) is at home does he/she spend a long time on one thing or does he/she move from one thing to another?

one _____ many _____ both _____

23. What is the best way to get him to do something he doesn't want to do?

bribe _____	yell _____	other _____
ask him _____	threaten _____	_____
tell him _____	hit _____	_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

24. What is the worst way?

bribe _____ yell _____ other _____
ask _____ threaten _____ _____
tell _____ hit _____ _____

25. When ( ) can't have his/her own way what does he/she do?

gives up _____ kicks feet _____ sulks _____
cries _____ hits _____ other _____
screams _____ asks why _____ _____

26. Does ( ) often get hurt? yes _____ no _____

27. What does he/she do when he/she gets hurt?

cries _____ sulks _____ other _____
asks for help _____ gets angry _____ tells no one _____

28. Do other children pick on ( )? yes _____ no _____

29. What does he/she do if someone does pick on him/her?

runs away _____ sulks _____ hits them _____
seeks help _____ tattles _____ other _____
cries _____ gets angry _____ _____

30. What are some things he/she does for himself/herself at home? (read alternatives if necessary)

dresses self _____ turns on TV _____ other _____
feeds self _____ _____

31. Does he/she have any problems such as (read alternatives)?

sucks thumb? _____ bites nails? _____ other _____
wets the bed? _____ cries at night? _____ _____

THANK YOU SO MUCH.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Child's Name_____
Parent's Name_____
Room No._____

PARENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE (Pre-school and Parent Program)

1. Did you attend any of the parent meetings? (Please check one)

____ Yes
____ No

2. If you did attend,

a. About how many meetings did you attend? (Please check one)

____ One
____ Two or Three
____ Four or Five
____ More than Five

b. What kind of activity did you like the best? (Please double check the ones liked best (✓✓) and single check (✓) the ones liked.)

____ Movies and discussions
____ Field trips in town (to the Library, art gallery and other places)
____ Field trips out of town (trips to Ozark, to farm)
____ Making things (such as Christmas gifts, hats, wastebaskets, dresses)
____ Talking with pre-school teachers
____ Visiting with pre-school
____ Listening to guest speakers
____ Special projects (like the Mini-mart, picture project, rummage sale)
____ Learning more about the pre-school program (orientation program, making take-home learning materials for child)
____ Attending Open House at the pre-school
____ Rap sessions (just meeting with other parents and talking)
____ Attending parties or picnics with other parents and pre-schoolers
____ Other: Please write in any activity or part of the parent program that you liked which is not listed above.

3. Whether you attended or not,

a. Which of the above activities would you suggest for a Parent Program next year? (Please check those you suggest in the spaces provided.)

1)___Movies and discussion, 2)___Field trips in town, 3)___ Field trips out of town, 4)___Making things, 5)___Talking with teacher, 6)___Visiting pre-school, 7)___Guest speakers, 8)___ Special projects, 9)___Learning about program, 10)___Attending Open House, 11)___Rap sessions, 12)___Attending parties, picnics.

b. What other activities for the Parent Program would you suggest for next year? (Please write these in the space below. If there is not enough space, write on the back of this sheet.)

_____
_____
_____

C. Which activities would you definitely take out of the program? (Please write in the space below if you have suggestions.)

_____
_____
_____

4. In your opinion, do you think there should be a Parent Program next year? (Please check one)

____ Yes
____ No
____ Don't know (have no opinion)

5. If you answered yes, what do you think is the best time to have parent meetings? (Please check one or more times you think best.)

____ Early morning (about 8 or 9 a.m.)
____ Middle of the morning
____ It makes no difference
____ Early afternoon
____ Late afternoon
____ In the evening (at night)

6. Where do you think the best places are to have parent meetings? (Please check one or more below.)

____ At the Pre-school
____ In school buildings
____ In a neighborhood church
____ It makes no difference
____ Other places: (Please write suggestions below.)

_____

7. In your opinion, what are some of the problems people have in getting to Parent meetings? (Please check one or more.)

____ Don't know
____ Parents just not interested
____ Working at time of meetings
____ Illness
____ Too many young children at home

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7 Continued

___ Can't get babysitter
___ No transportation
___ Meetings too far away from home
___ Other: Please indicate other kind of problems which you think make it difficult for some parents to attend.

_____
_____

8. In your opinion, how often should parent meetings take place? (Please check one.)

___ No idea
___ Once monthly
___ Twice monthly
___ Other: (Please write other suggestions below.)

_____
_____

9. What do you think was the most important thing your child got out of pre-school this year? (Please check one or add others in space provided.)

___ Learning to play and share with others
___ Learning numbers, colors, and alphabet
___ Other: (Please write what you think was the most important thing.)

_____
_____

10. If you have a younger child or if you had one, would you want him to attend a pre-school next year? (Please check one.)

___ Not certain
___ Yes
___ No

Please write any comments here.

_____
_____

11. SUGGESTIONS: We would appreciate any suggestions you might have for improving the pre-school or the Parent Program. (You can write these on the back side of this sheet if you need more space.)

APPENDIX I

DESCRIPTION OF THE PRESCHOOL AGE CHILD

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

Success in our schools depends in large measure on the ability to read. Most of our children have been limited in experiences that develop reading readiness skills. It is the primary purpose of the Head Start program to systematically develop the reading skills that will enable our children to succeed in public school. This is why the Kansas City, Missouri, Head Start program focuses directly on the speech and language development of the child.

Some of our children have language problems that result in part from over-crowded urban living. It is our purpose to create a structured program to aid in the transition between home and school. Much is known about the language deficits that prevent our children from succeeding in school. For example:

1. The Head Start child's experience with one-to-one verbal communication is usually limited.
   a. Single words are often used instead of sentences.
   b. Communication in the home is often in terms of direction and command rather than in terms of explanation. This makes it even more urgent that all adults in our program constantly and continually give explanations. We want to introduce our children to the pleasure that comes from communication with words. Adults need to listen to children with interest and respect and to be at the child's level as much as possible. Our children need to observe how the mouth looks when words are formed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

c. Curiosity appears to have been discouraged early in many of the children's lives. They do not ask questions. The question and answer process is unknown to most of our children. Teachers must continually ask questions and encourage children to ask questions.

2. There is so much noise in some living situations that children shut out sound We need to help certain children learn to hear. After a child is "turned on" to the world of sound, it is our intention to develop his capacity to listen.

3. Our children have limited exposure to the classification of knowledge They need to learn categories such as people, animals, plants, music, food, transportation, toys, jobs, and buildings.

4. Most of our children lack sensory experiences We need to utilize every opportunity to expand their sensory awareness and to encourage verbal descriptions of what they see, hear, feel, taste, and smell.

5. Many of our children have been confined to their neighborhoods and know nothing of the larger community. The purpose of taking children on trips into the community is to stimulate their curiosity, to enlarge their vocabulary, and to broaden their experience.

All children need nurture and development. Head Start is stressing three basic skills: language that meets the standards of school, concept-formation, and perceptual discrimination. Hopefully in Head Start and in the following grades, children will encounter teachers who expect them to learn and who will stimulate their curiosity and imagination.

APPENDIX J

A PORTRAIT OF THE KINDERGARTEN CHILD

A Portrait of the Kindergarten Child

Persons who work with the young child must be ever mindful of the fact that child development encompasses all growth- physical, emotional, social, and mental- is continuous and follows an orderly sequence but advances at varying rates of speed.

We believe that basically children are the same. However, children served by Urban Education have met with meager stimulation in the kinds of learnings that are important for academic success in school.

Thus it seems advisable to enumerate here the growth and developmental characteristics common to all preschool children. It is necessary to be knowledgeable about the four, five and six year olds because some Kindergarteners will be immature, average and mature.

Physically, the Kindergarten learner
- .has tremendous drive for physical activity but fatigues easily
- .needs frequent changes in activity
- .his large muscles are much better developed and small muscles that are in the process of growing stronger which enables him to hold scissors, etc. much easier
- .is susceptible to communicable diseases - especially respiratory ones.

Emotionally, the Kindergarten learner
- .needs a sense of belonging.
- .gauges his success or failure in terms of adult expectations.
- .searches for trust, fairness, and definite standards.
- .gains security from definite routine.
- .is not always able to distinguish right from wrong by adult standards.

Socially, the Kindergarten learner:
- .is anxious to win group approval.
- .can work and play independently.
- .is better able to accept help and direction from adults.
- .can enjoy a special friend, but works well in small, fluid groups.

Mentally, the Kindergarten learner:
- .learns by doing, experiencing, observing, questioning, imitating, examining, exploring and investigating.
- .is very curious.
- .seeks answers to his questions.
- .is more verbal and has some skills in both speaking and listening.
- .is able to talk instead of hitting.
- .clarifies understanding of relationships through dramatic play, art, movement and construction.
- .accomplishes goals set for himself because he tries only what he knows he can do.

APPENDIX K

EARLY CHILDHOOD-HEAD START EDUCATION PROGRESS REPORT

EARLY CHILDHOOD-HEAD START EDUCATION PROGRESS REPORT

Knows Name: First_____ Middle_____ Last_____
Knows Age: Years_____ Birthdate_____
Knows Address: _____

Knows body parts:
elbow___ shoulder___ fingers___
knee___ neck___ leg___ feet___

Knows function of senses:
eyes___ nose___ ears___ hands___
tongue___

Carries out directions:
single___ double___ triple___

Expresses self understandably in one or two simple, complete sentences___

Enjoys stories and is able to help tell them___

Recalls nursery rhymes and stories in sequence___

Counts to 10___, recognizes numerals 1-5___

Says or sings alphabet___ Recognizes some letters:
about 5___ about 16___ nearly all___

Recognizes own name___

Can detect words that: rhyme___ begin alike___

Names colors:
red___ yellow___ blue___ green___ orange___

Names shapes:
circle___ square___ triangle___ rectangle___

Indicates position:
in___ out___ up___ down___ on___ off___

Distinguishes between:
loud, soft___ big, little___

Names classification member:
family members___ pets___ foods___

Develops eye-hand coordination:
with crayons___ blocks___ beads___ brushes___
puzzles___ scissors___

Moves through space:
jump___ hop___ skip___

Has a positive self image___

Gets along well:
in groups___ with children___ with adults___

COMMENTS: _____

_____

TEACHER_____ CENTER_____ AREA SCHOOL_____

APPENDIX L

REVIEW TEST I

Check when child has mastered the item
Leave blank when child has not mastered the item

REVIEW TEST I

NAME _____ SEX ____ BIRTHDAY _____

ADDRESS _____ A.M. ____ TELEPHONE _____
P.M. ____

	X	REMARKS
Level I		
A. Self Image		
1. Knows his full name		
2. Learns his address		
3. Points to ten body parts -- elbow ( ), head ( ), shoulder ( ), stomach ( ), fingers ( ), knee ( ), neck ( ), leg ( ), feet ( )		
4. Names parts of the body previously mentioned		
B. Mental Readiness		
1. Understands and follow directions		
a. Stand Mary		
b. Walk to the door		
c. Tiptoe back to your chair		
d. Clap your hands loudly		
e. Clap your hands softly		
2. Recognizes placement and colors of stop lights -- red ( ), yellow ( ), green ( )		
3. Develops number concepts		
a. Counts to five		
b. Builds a mathematics vocabulary (1) big - little, (2) high - low, (3) up - down, (4) on - off, (5) first - last, (6) front-back, (7) fast - slow, (8) tall - short, (9) top - middle - bottom, (10) in - out		
c. Recognizes the shape of a circle and square		
C. Language Readiness		
1. Memorizes one short nursery rhyme (verbalizing or singing) Jack Be Nimble ( ) Humpty Dumpty ( )		
2. Memorizes one short safety poem Stop ! Look ! Listen !		
3. Sings three songs with the group Watch The Lights ( ) Two Little Birds ( ) Good Morning ( ) Good Afternoon ( )		
4. Learns to use courteous expressions Thank you ( ) Excuse me ( ) Please ( ) I am sorry ( )		
5. Develops auditory discrimination		
a. Learning to detect rhyming or sound alike words in song and poems learned		
b. Reproduces animals sounds -- cat ( ), dog( ), cow ( ), sheep ( )		
c. Distinguishes between loud and soft sounds		
6. Grows in ability to listen attentively to stories		
7. Comprehends and learns to pronounce names of objects, pictures and colors found in Vocabulary Kit		

REVIEW TEST I

	X	REMARKS
D Social and Emotional Readiness		
1. Learns to obey willingly		
2. Learns self-control		
3. Learns proper voice control		
4. Learns to respect the rights and property of others		
5. Learns to work harmoniously with the group		

APPENDIX M

REVIEW TEST II

Check when child has mastered the item
Leave blank when child has not mastered the item

REVIEW TEST II

NAME _____ SEX ____ BIRTHDAY _____

ADDRESS _____ A.M. ____ TELEPHONE _____
P.M. ____

LEVEL II	REMARKS
A. SELF IMAGE	
1. Recognizes his own first name	
2. Knows his age	
3. Knows function of 5 senses - eyes ( ), nose ( ), ears ( ), hands ( ), tongue( )	
Group Test (may be administered to small groups of children)	
B. KINESTHETIC and PHYSICAL READINESS	
1. Learns to tie a shoe	
2. Fastens buttons he can see	
3. Fastens his own coat	
4. Cuts fringe on end of paper	
C. MENTAL READINESS	
1. Puts together simple puzzles of five and six pieces	
2. Distinguish between real and make-believe	
3. Remembers instructions and can carry out two or three simple commands, after being told once, such as:"Put away crayons," "Bring me your papers," and "Sit down in your seat."	
4. Matches and names colors - red ( ), yellow ( ), green ( ), blue ( ), orange ( ), brown ( ), black ( )	
5. Differentiates between sizes of pictured things -) e.g. cat, kitten	
6. Distinguishes between sounds (e.g. bell, clap, cough)	
7. Counts in serial order to 8	
8. Recognizes the shape of a triangle	
9. Can trace numerals, kinesthetically and with correct formation from 0 - 2	
D. LANGUAGE READINESS	
1. Tells a personal experience in a 1 to 3 sentence story	
2. Memorizes any two of the four suggested songs or seasonal poems	
3. Uses a sentence for responding to questions (See Inside Sheet)	
4. Knows name of community helpers (at least 2) e.g. - a. What do we call a man that puts out fires? ( )	
b. Who helps us cross at the street near the school? ( )	
5. Learns weather changes by looking at weather pictures -- e.g. - rainy ( ), snowy ( ), sunny day ( ), windy day ( )	

	REMARKS
6. Tells a familiar story from properly arranged sequence cards	
7. Develops ability to do categorization leaves ( ), animals ( ), clothing ( )	
8. Comprehends and learns to pronounce names of objects, pictures and colors found in Vocabulary Kit	
E. SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL READINESS	
1. Participates in group activities	
2. Learns to take turns	
3. Completes his work in a reasonable length of time	
4. Uses initiative in finding things to do	
5. Listens without interrupting	
6. Takes part in discussion	
7. Lists social or emotional problems which might hinder child's learning	

APPENDIX N

EVALUATION OF PRE-SERVICE TRAINING MEETING

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX

This is the exact format of the Pre-Service Training Evaluation Questionnaire. The number of responses are typed on the appropriate lines.

EVALUATION OF PRE-SERVICE TRAINING MEETING
ST. STEPHENS BAPTIST CHURCH SEPTEMBER 8-14, 1970

(Please check one) Teacher 23 Other 5

1. In order to provide more useful and productive staff development activities in future years, we would like to have your opinion of the meetings you attended this year. In the pre-service training meetings, September 8-14, 1970, there were three basic types of presentations:

   General Sessions : Meetings where all participants attended the same presentation at the same time.

   Large Group Sessions: Meetings where a large number of participants, i.e., all Early Childhood personnel or all Head Start personnel, attended the same presentation at the same time.

   Small Group Sessions: Meetings where a special group, i.e., all new teachers, clerical staff, or a segment of the participants designated by their initial or assignment, attended the same presentation.

   A. For each type session -- General, Large Group or Small Group -- please check how useful you think that type session was in communicating information or developing ideas which were beneficial to you during the year, then include a comment on that type session.

      1. I think the General Sessions were: (Please check one)

         excellent 7% very useful 22% useful 42% of little use 18% useless 11%

      2. Comment: Everyone hearing the same thing at the same time. It is sometimes difficult to hear.

      2. I think the Large Group Sessions were: (Please check one)

         excellent 4% very useful 30% useful 48% of little use-18% useless ___

         Comment: Common concerns can be discussed. Needed to be better organized.

      3. I think the Small Group Sessions were: (Please check one)

         excellent18% very useful 49% useful 22% of little use 11% useless ___

         Comment: Get to know people. Real problems can be discussed. Small group sessions are usually poorly organized.

   B. Within each type of presentation, please select the three you felt were most informative or interesting. Indicate by placing a 1 on the line to the right of the most informative or interesting, a 2 for the next most, and a 3 by your third choice.

GENERAL SESSIONS

Fern Webster, Director, Kansas City ECE/Head Start Program

Rate 1 6 2 1 3 0 Rank 1 6 2 3 3 2

John Krevas, Director, Public Relations, Human Resources Corporation

Rate 1 0 2 4 3 0 Rank 1 0 2 0 3 0

Inall Spottsville, Program Specialist, Model Cities

Rate 1 1 2 4 3 1 Rank 1 0 2 0 3 0

Robert Wheeler, Area Superintendent, Division of Urban Education "Early Childhood Education 1970"

Rate 1 3 2 3 3 7 Rank 1 2 2 6 3 0

Norma Busch, Program Director, Kansas City, Missouri, Head Start "Child Development Birth to Five Years"

Rate 1 5 2 2 3 1 Rank 1 1 2 1 3 2

Helen Doyle, "The Institute for Pupil Studies and the Early Childhood Development Program"

Rate 1 4 2 2 3 1 Rank 1 3 2 2 3 4

Early Childhood Education Head Start Staff "The Team Approach"

Rate 1 5 2 2 3 0 Rank 1 3 2 2 3 3

Lewis Welton, Assistant Clinical Professor of Dentistry. "Dental Health for Head Start Children"

Rate 1 1 2 4 3 1 Rank 1 2 2 0 3 0

Frank Neff, Institute for Community Studies. "Evaluation of the Early Childhood Education Program"

Rate 1 1 2 2 3 4 Rank 1 1 2 2 3 2

Barbara Clemmons, Community Representative for the Office of Child Development "The Role of Parents in the Early Childhood Development Program"

Rate 1 1 2 3 3 2 Rank 1 0 2 0 3 3

LARGE GROUP SESSIONS

(Again, please rate the three sessions you felt were most informative or interesting, 1, 2, or 3.)

An overview of the Educational Program

Rate 1 3 2 1 3 2 Rank 1 2 2 2 3 2

Wilbur Goodseal, Coord. Speech Improvement "Speech and Language Development"

Rate 1 6 2 1 3 1 Rank 1 6 2 3 3 3

Helen Doyle, "Determining Individual Levels on School Instruction"

Rate 1 5 2 2 3 0 Rank 1 0 2 3 3 4

Karnes Workshop

Rate 1 5 2 4 3 0 Rank 1 2 2 5 3 1

Helen Doyle, "Instructional Techniques and Materials"

Rate 1 5 2 1 3 1 Rank 1 4 2 1 3 3

SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

(Again, please rate the top three presentations.)

Small Group meeting, first day

Rate 1 2 2 1 3 3 Rank 1 2 2 0 3 1

Judy Wilson, "Use of the Peabody Materials"

Rate 1 2 2 3 3 1 Rank 1 3 2 2 3 3

Thomas Chastain "Demonstration of Peabody Materials"

Rate 1 2 2 3 3 1 Rank 1 2 2 3 3 1

Language Development

Rate 1 3 2 2 3 0 Rank 1 3 2 3 3 3

Discipline

Rate 1 3 2 2 3 0 Rank 1 3 2 5 3 0

Questions answered by Social Services, Health Services, and Parent Involvement

Rate 1 0 2 3 3 0 Rank 1 2 2 1 3 3

Team Problems and Role Playing

Rate 1 0 2 3 3 0 Rank 1 2 2 2 3 2

Meetings with parents

Rate 1 1 2 3 3 0 Rank 1 0 2 0 3 1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. Your overall opinion of the grouping and format of in-service meetings are requested.

A. The size and the composition of pre-service or in-service training groups are determining factors in their usefulness. Although a variety of groupings is probably desirable, which of the following groupings do you find most useful to you as a teacher. Place a 1 by the most useful, 2 second, etc. (Rate 3, please)

General sessions with all program personnel

Rate 1 2 2 3 3 2 Rank 1 3 2 1 3 2

Building level meetings with all personnel

Rate 1 3 2 3 3 1 Rank 1 1 2 4 3 4

Meetings with all teachers in the program

Rate 1 6 2 1 3 0 Rank 1 6 2 2 3 1

Building level, just teachers

Rate 1 2 2 2 3 2 Rank 1 5 2 4 3 3

Interest meetings, select from several scheduled

Rate 1 4 2 2 3 1 Rank 1 3 2 4 3 6

Working in your own room with your aides, etc.

Rate 1 5 2 1 3 1 Rank 1 2 2 4 3 3

Other - what?

Rate 1 0 2 0 3 0 Rank 1 0 2 0 3 1

B. The format of pre-service and in-service meetings is also important. Once again, a variety is probably desirable, but which of the following do you find most useful to you as a teacher? Please place a 1 by the most useful, a 2 by the second most useful. (Rate 3, please)

Presentation of information by an expert (Lecture)

Rate 1 4 2 4 3 4 Rank 1 2 2 0 3 1

Discussion of methods or techniques with an expert

Rate 1 9 2 4 3 1 Rank 1 1 2 1 3 1

Demonstration of methods or techniques by an expert

Rate 1 9 2 1 3 2 Rank 1 2 2 2 3 0

Presentation of information by own administrator or support staff (panel or talk

Rate 1 3 2 5 3 3 Rank 1 1 2 1 3 2

Discussion of classroom methods or techniques by own staff

Rate 1 7 2 5 3 1 Rank 1 2 2 1 3 3

Demonstration of methods or techniques by staff

Rate 7 2 3 3 3 Rank 1 2 1 3 2

Presentation of information by teachers, etc.

Rate 1 2 2 4 3 6 Rank 1 0 2 0 3 2

Discussion of classroom problems and ideas with other teachers and support personnel in your building (rap sessions)

Rate 1 5 2 4 3 2 Rank 1 3 2 3 3 0

Participation in student type activities (dancing, painting)

Rate 1 5 2 6 3 0 Rank 1 0 2 2 3 1

Films

Rate 1 1 2 4 3 3 Rank 1 0 2 0 3 2

Demonstrations by children

Rate 1 4 2 3 3 5 Rank 1 1 2 1 3 0

Visiting other schools

Rate 1 8 2 3 3 1 Rank 1 1 2 2 3 0

APPENDIX O

EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

FEB. 8, 1971 - FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX

Open-end responses to the questionnaire items are listed.
The number providing each response is
entered to the right.

EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT - FEBRUARY 8, 1971 - FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1 - A.M. SESSION

1. What were the most important points made by Glenn Morgan in his presentation?

Not there	1
Evaluation is "good" (unspecified)	1
How to evaluate myself	1
Importance of goals, standards	2
Negative comments	4
Doesn't mean right or wrong	1
Flexibility of quality	4
Importance of knowing why	3

2. What parts of his presentation were most useful to <u>you</u>?

Not there	1
Explanation of evaluation	2
Discussion of self evaluation	2
Forms distributed	2
Importance of cooperation	1
Relationships	1
Goal setting and flexibility	1
Knowing why	1
Negative	1
Don't know	1
None	4
Blank	3

3. How do you think you will be able to use what he presented?

Not there	1
Forms distributed	2
Plan with staff	1
Self evaluate to improve myself	1
Think about evaluation	1
Use self evaluation more	2
Set goals for myself	1
Applying	1
Help others help self	1
Negative	2
No	2
Blank	4

4. Do you presently use any self evaluation tools? If yes, what?

Yes	13
No	4
Self prepared (vague)	7
Self prepared (specific)	3
Other prepared	1
Group discussion	2
Blank	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. What do you find to be the biggest problem with self-evaluation?

People are too self critical	1
People aren't objective (too easy)	9
Accepting criticism	1
Following through	2
Setting goals for self	1
Administrators don't push objectives	1
Taking time	1
Can't	1
Blank	2

PART II - P.M. SESSION

1. What do you think were the most important points in the presentation by ICS?

Information (unspecified)	2
How classes look, data by categories	3
Reasons for evaluation	2
Instrument and data collection procedures	6
Problems in data recorded, honest discussion of possible errors	3
Uses of data, interpretation	1
Percentages	1
Blank	1

2. What information in the report on PROSE was most useful to you?

Percentages, time spent in various areas	3
Role of adult interaction with teachers and aides	1
Group sizes	2
Science	1
Instructional areas	3
New way of looking at activities	2
Suggestions, interpretation	2
Need time to study	2
All of it	1
Blank	4

3. What information in the report on PROSE was least useful to you?

Activity level	2
Role of child/teacher	2
Sex/race	1
Positive/transition (exaggerated)	1
Blank entries	1
Interpretation provided, misjudgments	1
Must think about it	1
Percentages not meaningful	1
None	1
Blank	9

4. Do you think the data reflect the program at your teaching site? If no, how different?

Yes	10
No	4
Intuition	1
Too much variety in classrooms	1
Percentages too high in some areas	1
Don't know	2
Blank	3

5. Do you think these data will affect your work in the classroom in any way? If yes, how?

Yes	12
No	4
More aware of time usage	3
Try to work on certain areas	1
Transition	1
Materials	1
Someway	3
Must see my classroom	1
To improve	1
Negatives	1
Blank	2

6. What would be your reaction to having PROSE data gathered in your classroom and receiving data on your own class?

Would like	4
To get an objective view of activities	3
Data would be helpful to me	2
To give information for self-improvement	2
Its good	1
I'm already observed	1
Wouldn't like	--
Don't care	3
Meaningful but observers interrupt	1
Don't know if meaningful	1
Blank	6
One teacher marked all three with his reasons all based on the degree to which research can be useful in the classroom setting.	1

APPENDIX P

EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

FEB. 8, 1971 - FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This is the exact format of the Pre-Service Training Evaluation Questionnaire. The number of responses are typed on the appropriate lines.

EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT - FEBRUARY 8, 1971 - FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

A.M. SESSION - SELF EVALUATION

1. Glenn Morgan discussed self-evaluation and a form which could be used by teachers, aides, support personnel, etc. Have you completed the form?

   Yes 9 No 7 Blank 0

   If yes, did it suggest any changes you should make?

   Yes 8 No 1 Blank 1

   If yes, have you been able to make any of the changes suggested?

   Yes 4 No 3 Blank 1

   Please explain: No materials left, working with the team, looked at subject areas, planned more for individual children, increased student involvement, looked at teacher role, concentrate on continuity.

2. Have you developed or utilized any other self-evaluation procedures in February?

   Yes 9 No 6 Blank 2

   If yes, what were they? Increased creativity 3; freedom decoration, increased flexibility, follow-through, increased creativity, try to improve daily, maintain weekly objectives, revised daily program, more time with individual children.

P.M. SESSION

1. As you remember, the afternoon was devoted to information which observers collected in ECE/Head Start classes. Have you reviewed any of that information?

   Yes 14 No 2 Blank 1

   Do any of the percentages seem too high or too low for your class?

   Yes 5 No 8 Blank 3

   If yes, which ones? Teacher direction, transition is too high; child-child + too low; Blank - participation, health/hygiene, language too low, science and rhythms, child to child.

2. Has the observation information suggested any changes you should make in your class?

   Yes 13 No 3 Blank 1

   If yes, have you been able to make any of those changes?

   Yes 12 No 0 Blank 0

Please xplain: Increased science, shortened routine (2); increased communication more creative, increased pupil involvement, taped self to see what I do, had aide observe me, "more music time" (2); introduced more small group work (2); decreased transition time (4); helped withdrawn children. Blank - changed eating and restroom time, revised schedules.

APPENDIX Q

EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

MARCH 8, 1971

APPENDIX

This is the exact format of the Pre-Service Training Evaluation Questionnaire. The number of responses are typed on the appropriate lines.

EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT - MARCH 8, 1971

PART 1 - A.M. SESSION

Twenty-three teachers returned questionnaires on the A.M. sessions.

1. What were the most important points in Miss Beymer's talk?

   1. Certain stages in art are evident in every child. 11
   2. L t child do own thing (be creative). 9
   3. How children's drawing develops. 4
   4. Anything is right. 2
   5. All good. 1
   6. Look for progression and maturation levels in drawings. 1
   7. Importance of child's own experience with materials. 1
   8. Blank 1

2. What was most useful to you as a person working with pre-school children?

   1. Letting children be creative. 4
   2. New ways of painting and using crayons. 2
   3. All good. 2
   4. Importance of developing sense skills. 1
   5. Importance of art for pre-schooler. 1
   6. Variety of simple ideas for art activities. 1
   7. Most good. 1
   8. Accepting child's work as it is. 1
   9. Be more flexible. 1
   10. None 2
   11. Blank 6

PAPER AND PASTE

a. I think the activities provided were:

Enjoyable 17	Nothing new 4
Creative 15	Other: Informative 1;
Original 8	Very good 1

b. I have or can easily obtain all materials needed for the activities:

Yes 19 No 4

c. I learned new techniques for preparing or using materials:

Yes 18 No 5

If yes, what?

How to fold shapes. 4
Plastic for fingerpainting. 1
Hats. 1
Different things to do with crayons, textures, etc. 1
Sack puppets. 1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Cutting for different shapes. 1
Using scraps. 1
Allowing children to create. 1
Sponge painting. 1
New ways of making mobils and three dimension objects. 1
Blank 4

d. I plan to use something we did in my classroom:

Yes 20
No 1
Already do 1
Blank 1

CLAY

a. I think the activities provided were:

Enjoyable 15
Creative 10
Original 5
Nothing new 5

b. I have or can easily obtain all materials needed for the activities:

Yes 14
No 7
Blank 2

c. I learned new techniques for preparing or using materials:

Yes 14
No 9

If yes, what?

Painting clay without firing. 3
For preparing clay. 2
Fingerpainting, crayon. 1
Korpine clay workable. 1
Use of acerate. 1
Designs on clay. 1
Mixing and using clay. 1
Paint and mount clay. 1
Blank 1

d. I plan to use something we did in my classroom:

Yes 20
No 2
Blank 1

CRAYONS

a. I think the activities provided were:

Creative 18
Enjoyable 13
Original 9
Nothing new 1

b. I have or can easily obtain all materials needed for the activities:

Yes 21
No 2

c. I learned new techniques for preparing or using materials:

Yes 15 Blank 2
No 6

If yes, what?

Textures with crayons. 8
Color washing of crayon work. 1
New ways of using simple pasted circles. 1
Combining colors and paints. 1
Sponge and gadget painting. 1
Materials in classroom or brought from home. 1
Blank 3

d. I plan to use something we did in my classroom:

Yes 23 No 0

PAINT

a. I think the activities provided were:

Creative 8 Nothing new 5
Enjoyable 8 Blank 10
Original 2

b. I have or can easily obtain all materials needed for the activities:

Yes 10 Blank 10
No 3

c. I learned new techniques for preparing or using materials:

Yes 8 Blank 10
No 5

If yes, what?

Pulling paint-soaked string over paper. 2
Taking prints of finger paintings. 2
Using other parts of hand beside fingers. 1
How to make and plan variety of activities. 1
Use of gadgets with paint. 1
Materials already in classroom. 1

d. I plan to use something we did in my classroom:

Yes 13 Blank 10
No 0

PART II - P.M. SESSIONS

Eleven teachers completed the questionnaires on the afternoon sessions.

1. What was most interesting in Eunice Livingston's presentation?

1. Emotional excitement. 1
2. Practical application. 1
3. Enriched actual classroom activity. 1
4. Demonstrations of activities to develop gross motor skills. 1
5. Encourage children to use all muscles to develop motor skills. 1
6. Short periods of activity at intervals. 1
7. All of it. 1
8. Knowing value of motor skills. 1
9. Stages of balancing. 1
10. Sequential learning from easy to more difficult. 1
11. Leading up to balance exercises. 1
12. Obstacle game. 1
13. Blank 1

2. What do you feel will be most useful to you in work?

1. All. 2
2. Most everything. 2
3. Obstacle games. 1
4. Sequential learning from easy to more difficult. 1
5. To develop desire to want to accomplish muscular activities. 1
6. Suggestions for children who need special help. 1
7. Ways to develop gross and fine motor skills. 1
8. Blank 3

3. Do you feel you learned anything new about Montessori teaching from the film?

Yes 9
No 1
Blank 1
Sequence to follow to final goal 3

4. Did you see anything you felt you could apply in your classroom?

Yes 8
No 0
Blank 3

If yes, what?

Almost everything. 3
Sandpaper letters. 2
Geography. 1
Insets and templates. 1
Too much to write. 1
Letting children serve snacks to each other. 1
Using towels to indicate child's own activity. 1
Use of matching cards and materials. 1
Use of blindfold for tactical learning. 1
Techniques of teaching sounds. 1
Blank 1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART III - P.M. BANNEKER

Eleven teachers completed questionnaires.

1. What was most interesting in Elaine Alpers presentation?

1. Different games and tools to teach words and letter sounds. 2
2. Materials and methods suggested. 1
3. Her enthusiasm. 1
4. What we can do to make speech "happen" every day. 1
5. Taking speech from concrete to abstract. 1
6. Sandpaper letters. 1
7. Using objects for initial sounds. 1
8. How to help child correct speech. 1
9. Using mirror. 1
10. Different concepts. 1
11. Singled out dialect of black children as major problems. 1
12. Do not try to change children's way of talking. 1
13. How to help teach speech and alphabet. 1
14. Blank 1

MARCH 8, 1971, STAFF TRAINING - FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

2. What do you think will be more useful to you in working with children?

1. Suggestions for teaching rhyming, letters, and sounds. 1
2. Concentrate more on their speech and mind. 1
3. Too many points to list. 1
4. Sandpaper letters. 1
5. Using objects for initial sounds. 1
6. How to help child correct speech. 1
7. Using mirror. 1
8. Presenting abstracts with words. 1
9. Presenting sounds. 1
10. Concrete objects shown. 1
11. Speak softly. 1
12. How to say words. 1
13. How to stimulate child to learn. 1
14. Games and tools to use to teach sounds of letters and words. 1
15. Blank 1

3. Did you learn anything in the small group sessions which you feel you can apply in the classroom?

Yes 2 Blank 8
No 1

If yes, what?

Games to play with sounds. 1
Order to teach alphabet sounds. 1
Listening. 1

APPENDIX R

MARCH 8, 1971, STAFF TRAINING - FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX

This is the exact format of the Pre-Service Training Evaluation Questionnaire. The number of responses are typed on the appropriate lines.

MARCH 8, 1971, STAFF TRAINING - FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

There was a good return on the follow-up questionnaires.

PART 1 - A.M. SESSION

1. Miss Beymer spoke of stages in the development of children's art work. How would you characterize the children in your classes?

A.M. Nearly all at a different stage. 6
Wide range of stages. 9
Nearly all the same. 3

P.M. Nearly all at a different stage. 2
Wide range of stages. 8
Nearly all the same. 6

2. About how frequently have the children worked with art materials since March 8?

Nearly every day. 16
A couple times a week. 4
Once or twice. 1
Once a week. 0
None. 0

3. If you have used any of the art ideas presented in the workshop, will you indicate what they were?

a. Paper and paste. 7
Shape pictures 3
Strips and drips. 2
Flowers 2
Rabbits 2
Collages 1
Cards 1
Hats 1
Abstract designs 1
Rings 1

b. Clay 5
Small gifts 1
Pla-do 1

c. Crayons 13
Rubbings 14
String 2
Self-portraits 1
Painting 1
Texture on paper 1

d. Paint 12
Gadget and string 3
Free experiment 2

e. Print Making 7
Gadget printing 2
Medicine dropper 1
Sponge printing 1
String 1

PART II - P.M. SWOPE PARKWAY

1. Do you have any pupils who scored low on any part of the Denver Test (the one administered by the Institute for Pupil Studies?)

A.M. Yes 6 — About how many? 8(1); 2(2); 1(2)
No 0

P.M. Yes 6 — About how many? 6(1); 3(1); 2(2); 1(1)
No 1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Have you had a chance to use any of the developmental activities which were suggested by Eunice Livingston?

Yes 10
No 1

Blank 12

3. If yes, which ones have you used?

Gross Motor 4
a. Indoor play equipment 2
b. Obstacle race 2
c. Hop, skip, jump, etc. 1
d. Balance 1
e. Tricycle riding 1

Fine motor-adoptive 2
a. Sorting small objects 2
b. Threading 2
c. Feeling shapes 1
d. Table games 1
e. Reproduce simple shapes/figures 1

Language 2
a. Puppets 2
b. Songs 1
c. Careful listening 1
d. Watch lips 1

Personal/Social 1
a. Choosing friend 1
b. Sharing activities 1
c. Express feelings 1

4. Have you been able to use any of the Montessori approaches in your classroom?

Yes 10
No 0

Blank 13

5. If yes, what?

a. Let child help one another 1
b. Lacing frames 1
c. Choose own activity 1
d. Put toys away 1
e. Play one at a time
f. Sounds and feel 1
g. Tactile 1
h. Small gross motor control
i. Planned, sequent, teaching 1

PART III - P.M. BANNEKER

1. Do you have any children in your class with minor speech problems?

A.M. Yes 8
No 2

About how many? 3 (3); 2 (2); 1 (2)

P.M. Yes 8
No 1

About how many? 4 (1); 3 (2); 2 (1); 1 (4)

2. Have you used any techniques suggested by Elaine Alper to help these children?

Yes 5
No 3

Blank 15

3. If yes, what have you used?

a. Combined gross motor and language 1
b. Listening attentively and not rushing child 1
c. Concrete to abstract 1
d. Using complete sentences 1
e. Emphasizing word endings 1
f. Talk more slowly 1
g. Introduce M and S sounds 1
h. Tongue exercises 1
i. Asking child to repeat 1

APPENDIX S

STAFF DEVELOPMENT - MAY 10 IN-SERVICE

APPENDIX S

STAFF DEVELOPMENT - MAY 10 IN-SERVICE
N=28

1. What were the most important points in Doctor Barker's talk?

   Difference in life styles - 4
   Positive-negative strokes - 3
   Try to understand others' motives - 3
   Can react on 3 levels - 2
   I'm ok, you're ok - 1
   Personality - 1
   Role playing - 1
   Importance of positive self image - 1
   Be flexible - 1
   Understand one self - 1
   PAC and interaction - 1
   Roles - 1
   Be responsible and constructive - 1
   All of it - 2
   No response - 8

2. Did you feel the Small Group discussions helped clarify the things she talked about?

   Yes - 19
   No - 7
   No response - 2

3. Do you feel the length of the Small Group discussions was:

   Too short - 3
   About right - 23
   Toolong - 1
   No response - 2

4. Do you feel the size of the Small Group discussions was:

   Too small - 3
   About right - 24
   Too large - 0
   No response - 1

5. Do you feel you have more ideas about handling problems with your students? Please explain.

More praise - 2
Positive approach to developing self image - 2
How to handle myself - 2
Handle each child differently - 1
How to handle adults - 1
No response - 20

6. How can "parent" behavior sometimes be helpful?

Nurturing type - 12
In instruction - 3
Positive approach - 2
In understanding children - 1
Acting as models - 1
Make orders known - 1
Think before acting/speaking - 1
Working with teacher - 1
Give freedom of choice - 1
No response - 10

7. How can "parent" behavior sometimes be not helpful?

Overly critical - 9
Too rigid - 6
Negative, demanding - 2
Not work with others - 2
Feelings of guilt - 1
Acting as models - 1
Unacceptable behavior - 1
No response - 10

8. When your "child gets hooked," what can you do about it?

Bring out adult - 9
Recognize problem/Act - 4
Don't give in - 1
Keep cool - 1
Encourage child/parent - 1
Consult drug expert - 2
Recognize child's need - 1
Help him see other side - 1
Be reasonable - 1
No response - 11

APPENDIX T

EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX
Evaluation of Administrative Effectiveness
Suggested Areas For Discussion

EQUIPMENT

Furniture

Physical Education

Audio Visual

Other Instructional

SUPPLIES

Books

Paper

Art

Crafts

Games

Other

PLANT

Space

Facilities

Location

Maintenance

Other

PERSONNEL

Recruitment

Employment

Preparation

In-Service

Performance

PARTICIPANTS

Recruitment of Pupils

Attendance

Health

RELATED ACTIVITIES

Parent Participation

Volunteers

ICS

IPS

Speech and Hearing

Other Referral

Transportation

ADMINISTRATION

Program Planning

Decision Making

Acquisition of Material and Supplies

Preparation of Plant

Staff Supervision

Personnel

Purchasing

APPENDIX U

PRE-SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

PRE-SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

(Please check one) Teacher ___ Other ___

I. The quality, quantity, and acquisition of equipment, materials, and supplies are essential to the execution of your instruction program.

Please indicate below your opinion of the materials you have received by checking the answer you think appropriately reflects your opinion: check either E (excellent); A (adequate); or L (limited) in each of the three areas, Quality, Quantity, Acquisition, for each of the categories of materials listed. Note: if certain items reflect the rating you give more than others, underline those items to emphasize their significance to your rating. Note: exceptions under Comments.

TYPE	QUALITY (Is it what you need & does it work well?)			QUANTITY (Do you have the variety & the amts. needed?)			ACQUISITION (Is it easy to get when you need it?)			COMMENTS
	E	A	L	E	A	L	E	A	L	
1. Classroom furniture & fixtures (such as chalkboards, cupboards, sinks, easels, tables, chairs)										
2. Classroom equipment (such as projectors, record players, tape recorders, slides)										
3. Instructional materials (such as books, magazines, puzzles, toy stoves, games)										
4. Consumable supplies (such as paper, crayons, craft materials, soap, clay)										
5. Temporary durable materials (such as films, records, pictures, pets, plants)										
6. Playground equipment										

TYPE	QUALITY (Is it what you need & does it work well?)			QUANTITY (Do you have the variety & the amts needed?)			ACQUISITION (Is it easy to get when you need it?)			COMMENTS
	E	A	L	E	A	L	E	A	L	
7. Other (What)										

II. The instructional site is also important to the on-going program. Would you rate each of the following on how they met your needs this year? E is for excellent; A is for adequate; L is for limited. Comments on your entries are encouraged.

SITE	FACILITY	E	A	L	COMMENTS
The Building's	LOCATION				
	APPEARANCE				
	FACILITIES				
	CLEANLINESS				
	SIZE				
The Cafeteria's	LOCATION				
	FACILITIES				
	FOOD				
	MENU				
The Playground's	LOCATION				
	FACILITIES				
	SIZE				
Your Classroom's	LOCATION				
	FACILITIES				
	SIZE				
	HEAT				
	LIGHT				

III. Beside your classroom you have had contact with many ancillary activities this year. We feel three aspects relative to these activities are important: 1. Involvement by you, the teacher; 2. Help which you feel they have given the students; and 3. Changes you think are desirable to improve the activity.

Beside each entry below, will you indicate the degree to which you have been involved, feel the program has helped children, and how much you feel it needs to be changed. Enter G for Greatly, S for Some, and N for Not at all.

ACTIVITY	INVOLVED			HELPED			CHANGE			COMMENTS
	G	S	N	G	S	N	G	S	N	
1. Parent Participation										
2. Volunteers										
3. Evaluation (ICS)										
4. Institute for Pupil Studies										
5. Speech & Hearing										
6. Social Services										
7. Health Services										
8. Transportation										
9. Other (What?)										

IV. A. Teachers are probably the most crucial factor in the success of any program. How to attract and retain good teachers is always a concern.

1. You have worked this year with a number of pre-school teachers.

2. Please rate how important each of the following in terms of their importance in developing good pre-school teachers. Place a check in the appropriate box on each line.

	VERY IMPORTANT	QUITE IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
Special university training for pre-school teaching					
Courses in Educational Methods					
Courses in Psychology					
Courses in Sociology					
Teaching experience					
Community work experience					
Being a parent					
In-service training					
Other (What?)					

IV. B. What has helped you most to do a good job this year? Please place a check on each line in the appropriate box.

	VERY HELPFUL	QUITE HELPFUL	SOMEWHAT HELPFUL	NOT TOO HELPFUL	NOT AT ALL HELPFUL
Your previous training					
Your previous experience					
Program objectives and guides					
Teaching materials					
In-service training					
University courses					
Supervisory staff					
Other teachers					
Other program staff					
Other (What?)					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

V. A very crucial part of any program development is the way in which major policy is mined and carried out. Your perception on how this has been done and should be done in the future are essential in assessing program functioning. Please respond frankly.

A. Although many factors have been involved in the development of the ECE/Head Start Program, some have had more effect on the final decisions than others. Please rank, in the first column below, the factor in terms of how instrumental they have been in determining the nature of the final program. In the second column, rank how instrumental they should be in the future. A rank of 1 is most instrumental, 2 is second most instrumental, etc.

PLEASE RANK HOW INSTRUMENTAL THEY HAVE BEEN IN DETERMINING THE PROGRAM		PLEASE RANK HOW INSTRUMENTAL THEY SHOULD BE IN THE FUTURE
_____	Pre-school traditions	_____
_____	Washington, D. C.	_____
_____	K.C. School District Staff	_____
_____	Model Cities	_____
_____	Human Resources Corporation	_____
_____	Parent Advisory Committee	_____
_____	Robert Wheeler	_____
_____	Fern Webster	_____
_____	ECE/Head Start Administrators	_____
_____	Teachers	_____
_____	Parents	_____
	Others (Who?)	
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

lease check that you ranked each factor on both how instrumental it has been (left olumn) and how instrumental it should be in the future (right column).

VI. The duties actually performed by specific persons greatly determine the effectiveness of the operation of any program. In the two questions below, you are asked to indicate who has been involved in and who has been primarily responsible for major duties.

A. For each of the duties listed below, will you please place a check (✓) in the column below the title of people who actively participated in carrying out that duty. Check as many as apply.

	PROGRAM DIR.	EDUC. DIR.	INSTR. LEADER	PSYCH.	TEACHERS	AIDES	OTHERS (WHO?)
Determine Policy							
Administer the Program							
Supervise Teachers							
Advise Teachers							
Teach Children							
Assist in Teaching Children							
Help Children with Special Problems							
Work with Parents							

NOW, will you please go back over the duties and circle the check in the column of the person primarily responsible for that duty. That is, you should have one check circled on each line.

VII. In trying to understand the operation of any program it is important to know what the basic goal or purpose of the program is.

A. As you see it, what is the main purpose of a pre-school education program?

1. _____
_____
_____

B. How clear have you been about what the program leaders expected you to attain with the children?

_____1. Very clear
_____2. Quite clear
_____3. Clear enough
_____4. Not too clear
_____5. Not at all clear

C. How appropriate have the expectations of the program leaders been, given the situation in which you have had to work?

_____1. The expectations have been much too high
_____2. Too high
_____3. A bit high
_____4. About right
_____5. The expectations have been too low

D. How clear have you been about how good a job the instructional leaders think you are doing?

_____1. Very clear
_____2. Quite clear
_____3. Clear enough
_____4. Not too clear
_____5. Not at all clear

E. Have you had the information you need (about the children, program supplies, program activities, schedules, available staff assistance, etc.) to do your job well?

_____1. I've had much more information than I needed.
_____2. About the right amount
_____3. More than I needed
_____4. Somewhat less than I needed
_____5. I've had much less information than I needed.

F. How do you feel about the pay that you have received this year?

_____1. The pay is very high.
_____2. Quite high
_____3. About right
_____4. Somewhat low
_____5. The pay is very low.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

G. How do you feel about the recognition you have received for your work this year?

_____1. I've had a great deal of recognition.
_____2. Quite a bit
_____3. Some
_____4. A little
_____5. I've had almost no recognition.

H. How much opportunity have you had this year to do things in your work that you really enjoy doing?

_____1. A great deal of opportunity
_____2. Quite a bit
_____3. As much opportunity as I want
_____4. A little
_____5. Almost no opportunity

I. From what you have observed, how well organized and administered has the pre-school program been this year?

_____1. Exceptionally well organized and administered
_____2. Very well
_____3. Quite well
_____4. Fairly well
_____5. Not too well organized and administered

J. How clearly have your duties and responsibilities been defined this year?

_____1. Very clearly
_____2. Quite clearly
_____3. Clearly enough
_____4. Not too clearly
_____5. Not at all clearly

K. All things considered, how satisfied are you with the way the pre-school program has worked this year?

_____1. Very satisfied
_____2. Quite satisfied
_____3. Fairly well satisfied
_____4. Not too satisfied
_____5. Not at all satisfied

Additional comments: _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX V

EVALUATION OF MODEL CITIES PROJECT FOR IDENTIFICATION, REMEDIATION AND BEHAVIORAL MANAGEMENT OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN THE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation of Model Cities Project for Identification, Remediation and Behavioral Management of Handicapped Children in the Early Childhood Education Program

by

S. Joseph Weaver, Ph. D.

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide the following:

(1) an assessment of the effectiveness of procedures of the Division of Urban Education staff for identifying and referring children likely to have school adjustment problems related to physical, developmental, psychological, social, and emotional problems and handicaps.

(2) a determination of the adequacy of procedures followed by the Institute for Pupil Studies (a sub-contractor of the School District of Kansas City) for receiving referrals, initiating contacts, preparing diagnoses, prescribing remediation, conducting, assisting or monitoring the special program of social, psychological and medical services for children, and counseling and assisting the families of these children.

In performing parts (1) and (2) above the following was carried out: (a) reviewed appropriate documents and records regarding the overall organization and structure of the Early Childhood Development Program and the particular goals, target group, activities and procedures of the special education component of the project, (b) selected a sample of cases handled by the Institute for Pupil Studies and assessed the appropriateness of the recommendations for treatment and the implementation of those recommendations, (c) observed two special education classrooms in operation, (d) interviewed selected members of the Early Childhood Development Program staff (both ECE and HS) and all staff of the Institute for Pupil Studies, (e) prepared this written summary of findings and recommendations.

Identification and Referrals

Organization of this report will in general follow the goals set in the preceding section. Thus, the first question is the effectiveness of the procedures for identifying and referring children likely to have school adjustment problems related to physical, developmental, psychological,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

social, and emotional problems and handicaps. In general, the Early Childhood Development Program through its agent, The Institute for Pupil Studies (IPS), seems to have developed an efficient and comprehensive system of identifying and referring such children for evaluation, treatment, and specialized educational programming. S ch identification and subsequent referral incorporate three carefully graduated steps. These progress from a brief but nevertheless formal testing on an individual basis of virtually all children in the project (except those being screened and tested by other similar agencies) to in-depth multidisciplinary evaluations involving social case work, health screening, psychological, educational and perceptual-motor testing, and various supplementary medical services, i.e. neurological, psychiatric, ophthalmological. A child with a problem should be located effectively and efficiently through such a system.

Every child screening. This system has several advantages perhaps not immediately apparent. In the first place every child gets some formal screening. Secondly, this brief formal screening is reasonably economical and professional. The screening instrument, the Denver Developmental Screening Test (DDST) was developed especially for this purpose and is rapidly achieving increasing use throughout the country. When used for the purpose for which it was designed, i.e. screening, it is considered a reliably adequate test. Also, the provision in IPS procedures for re-testing with the instrument children who demonstrate a questionable performance on the first administration adds to the reliability of its findings.

One perhaps hidden virtue of this testing program is that it also insures IPS personnel are directly in contact with every child in every

classroom. This in turn adds immeasurably to the second procedure which is used to screen all children -- the usual informal notice by a child's teacher that something is amiss. Since IPS personnel are around during testing, the teachers and other school people get acquainted with them on a personal level. My interviews with these other school personnel indicate such informal contacts are now a regular and important facet of the identification and referral process. Indeed, these harmonious, and apparently mutually profitable contacts seem to be increasing in importance as greater understanding and appreciation of the functions of IPS have developed. The IPS staff has built up feelings of trust and respect between themselves and the other school personnel. This is no accident and is probably directly attributable in large measure to the personal and professional competence of the IPS staff in general.

I would like to emphasize this aspect of their procedures since I believe a planned attempt to create such trust and respect was made by IPS based upon very realistic considerations -- namely the worries and concerns of the other school agencies and personnel concerning the role of this "new" agency. In my interviews the other school personnel stated plainly they had such concerns at first and only came to lay them aside as the IPS people "proved" themselves considerate, understanding of the special problems involved, and perhaps above all, professionally competent. In my talks with the directors or supervisors of the other school programs the professional competence of specific IPS staff was spontaneously mentioned. The director and one IPS staff member were specifically singled out several times although the overall staff was similarly described.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One recommendation would be that provision be made for early screening with the DDST. Both the IPS staff and members of the ECE-HS staffs spontaneously stated they could refer children earlier and start treatment programs earlier with such a change. It would be desirable to hire temporary workers full time at the beginning of the school year and quickly screen all children in the first month or so.

Contacts and Diagnoses

The number of children served as of March 31, 1971 (7 months of operations) were 631 screened on the DDST, 123 given Brief Service, and 59 given a Full Service. Also, 156 of the children in the latter two categories were tested on another screening instrument, The Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration, in order to identify those needing special visual-motor perceptual training. Given the usual difficulties in starting a new program, the actual number of children serviced seems quite adequate. It might also be noted that the 59 children seen for Full Service required complicated and fairly sophisticated diagnostic evaluations and treatments from many disciplines. Such service must by its nature require individual attention over a fairly long period of time and it is quite expensive and time consuming. The well recognized difficulties in getting fathers and mothers of such children to respond to requests from schools and/or other social agencies further complicates the process. Study of the IPS records as well as conversations with teachers and the mothers themselves indicate that the IPS personnel do not give up after writing letters or making phone calls and getting little response. They go to the homes, offer to pay for expensive medical examinations, arrange for appointments, provide

transportation, and in some cases, personally conduct the mother and child to the hospital. I would say that if such personalized service were not provided these usually harassed, tired, and frequently overwhelmed parents, the child would continue to stumble along without the needed physical, social, and emotional evaluations and treatment.

Brief Service. If a child demonstrates a developmental lag on one or more of the four major areas of the DDST (Personal-Social, Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Language) he is scheduled for a Brief Service evaluation in approximately one month. This consists of a second administration of the DDST, a health and neurological screening and the Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration (VMI). Furthermore, suggestions for remedial instruction are developed and continuing consultation with the child's teacher in the ECE-Head Start program is initiated. When educational intervention is not sufficient, the child is recommended for a Full Service evaluation.

This is an efficient and economical method of checking upon apparent identification of a child with a problem. The reduced reliability of scores in any one of the four major areas on the DDST is countered by re-administration of the test. If a child simply had a bad day the first time, he will probably do better the second time and eliminate the need for giving him the much more expensive and time-consuming Full Service evaluation. Also, at this time the IPS nurse collects developmental information, administers visual and auditory screening, and carries out a neurological screening. Recommendations may be made at this point for various supplementary medical examinations, i.e. psychiatric, neurological.

My impression is that referrals for neurological and visual evaluations

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are adequate but referrals for auditory and speech and language evaluations could be increased. Audiologists generally do not consider the ticking watch test adequate to rule out various forms of hearing impairment. They do not even consider the use of a Beltone Audiometer adequate for children with noticeable speech and language disturbances. If a child does not have any such speech or language impairment such gross screening probably is sufficient. However, my study of the IPS records and observation of the classes indicates that speech and language problems may constitute the most prevalent handicap. Indeed, they seem so pervasive that I think a speech and language person should be a member of the IPS staff. In addition to the expert knowledge such a person would contribute to IPS deliberations and procedures, his presence would focus attention upon this critical area.

I would also recommend that the visual screening incorporate use of the Flash Card Vision Test for Children which is available from the New York Association for the Blind, 111 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022. This test is especially suited for non-verbal, shy, and low mental age children. It can frequently be administered to children who fail to respond to the conventional "E" chart. In my review of the files I noticed a fair number of children who did not respond reliably to such testing.

Full Service. The Full Service evaluation seems to be a comprehensive integration of a variety of evaluations carried out in a definitely professional fashion. Previous evaluations are secured from hospitals and other professional agents who have dealt with the child in the past. Parental and school interviews are supplemented by the presence of relevant school

personnel at staffings. Reports from the supplementary medical and allied health professions are utilized. In general my study of the reports of these evaluations combined with discussions with the staff involved gave me the impression that they are picking up on the many problems that these children have. In particular, these full evaluations reveal a child may be referred for "hyperactivity," "short attention span," or "speech" but the closer examination of all aspects of his social, physical, and emotional life reveals additional problems. These additional problems range from a need for "immediate and extensive dental work," to "congenital dysphasia." I should mention that the social workups indicate in case after case that the family is plagued with a host of social, economic, and emotional problems. IPS clearly is rendering badly needed services to these families and children. If the remedial actions do prove to have lasting effects upon the children, the savings to the community in years to come should more than compensate for the costs of the project.

An analysis of the primary and secondary disabilities of the 59 children given Full Service reveals the following numbers of children in various disability categories: Developmental - 21, Delayed Speech and Language - 3, Neurological - 20, Physical - 1, Mentally Retarded - 1, and Emotionally Disturbed - 8. It should be noted that the Neurological category breaks down into Cerebral Dysfunction - 5, Hyperactivity - 13, and Convulsive Disorder - 2. The secondary disabilities are as follows: Delayed Speech and Hearing - 15, Neurological - 3, Physical - 6, Mentally Retarded - 6 and Emotionally Disturbed - 2.

I would point out that under the category of Hearing Impairment (a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sub-category of Physical) only one child was recorded. In view of the large number of children (N=18) with a speech and language disability I can't help wondering if more sophisticated audiological evaluation would turn up a hearing impairment. Furthermore, my observations of the children lead me to wonder if the Developmental Category doesn't also include children who either have specific lags in other categories such as speech and language or are generally slow to develop overall and might be properly classified in the mentally retarded category which is conspicuously vacant. I do understand the reluctance of the IPS staff to label a child retarded in view of the massive social and emotional deprivation many of them have suffered and in view of the possible effects of such labeling upon children. Unfortunately, failure to see retardation as no more than a statement of current level of functioning without any surplus meanings of irreversibility probably does result in a distortion of diagnosis and record keeping.

Another point worth mentioning is the classification of 13 children who were called hyperactive in the Neurological category. My observations of some of these children in their Small Special Class indicated these children are no longer hyperactive. They are in general still somewhat distractible and do have somewhat short attention spans but their behavior in general is so appropriate and under teacher control that I question whether the originally observed hyperactivity might not better be labeled "overactivity" and be classified under some category other than "Neurological." As a side note the marked improvement of these children was one of the strongest arguments I could find for the worth of the IPS ECE-HS program. These children were sitting quietly listening to teachers, raising their hands to be called upon,

and performing requested tasks like many other pre-school children. My major point was simply that the marked improvement of these children calls into question the label "Neurological" which does have some implication of irreversibility.

One recommendation that might provide additional help for the IPS staff would be that they be afforded the services of a medical consultant (preferably a pediatric ...; and a doctoral level allied he. 'th professional consultant (audiologist, psychologist, speech pathologist, etc.) for brief reviews of difficult diagnostic or treatment cases. These consultants might meet once a week or twice a month at Special Diagnostic or Treatment Staffings and provide a continuing high level supervision of complicated and troublesome cases as well as general advice and guidance. Such supplementary consultation is common in excellent clinical programs and would undoubtedly be of benefit to the IPS as well as ECE-HS.

Remediation and Management

Assessment of remediation and management of the handicapped children seen by IPS falls mainly into several phases. After the child has been identified and referred even for the Brief Service, the IPS staff makes a diagnosis and recommendations for various social, physical, and educational efforts. Then the staff expands and implements these recommendations. The major emphasis is upon instructional suggestions and educational consultation to the child's teacher but case work with the child's parents, and perhaps, a specific medical referral are also involved. If the child demonstrates further failure to develop satisfactorily, another round of diagnosis, recommendations, and intensified social, educational,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and health remedial efforts follows. There is some inevitable overlap in these phases and one might very well categorize the IPS efforts at providing an integrated, generally sequenced, progressively more intensive, multi-disciplinary program of diagnosis and treatment. An example of one typical Full Service case may provide the best understanding of the complications involved in these children's remediation and management.

L.A. was initially referred because of "language problems" and "hyperactivity". She was observed by IPS personnel who described her behavior in terms of the four major categories on the DDST. Her Gross Motor coordination was "adequate", she "enjoyed" Fine Motor skills, her Language seemed echolalic, and her Personal-Social skills were characterized by friendly relations with adults and by "wanting in" to everything with other children. She was also described as hyperactive. Parental interviews revealed the parents were concerned about her unusual speech and that she had been seen at Menorah Hospital for speech therapy. Her health history showed she had a congenitally defective kidney and had been on medication for this since 8 months of age. The neurological screening indicated possible problems. Recommendations were for writing the pediatrician for an explanation of the effects of medication, a possible neurological evaluation based upon information supplied by the pediatrician, behavior modification for increased attention span, and some specific instructional suggestions for her educational program which would stress language and some gross motor exercises.

A report was sent to the school and instructional program was started 1 1/2 months after referral was initiated. Thus, treatment started right

away even though the case had not been completely diagnosed. Such quick treatment seems to be a definite advantage of the IPS procedures. L. A. was also given a psychological evaluation and information collected from the pediatrician. He stated there were no findings to suggest organic reasons for her hyperactivity or speech so he recommended a referral to a pediatric neurologist. IPS made such a referral, worked with the parents, and paid the neurologist. The DDST was repeated and delays found in language and gross motor. Her teacher was contacted during this time and she reported the child was "tensing up" and "scared". The neurologist completed his evaluation and reported her EEG was completely normal, she had congenital dysphasia, and possible retardation. He recommended speech therapy and full psychometric testing. Another parent interview at this point found the parents were worried over the possible retardation. IPS is of course still working with this case who is now in a Special Small Class. I observed her and found her hyperactivity gone but her speech or language problem still noticeable. She was participat[illegible], happily in the class but did demonstrate remarkable inability to produce a response when offered the opportunity to speak. IPS is considering the desirability of another referral for a psychiatric evaluation at this time.

This case demonstrates how IPS staff routinely incorporate recommendations of medical and school consultants in their procedures. I feel they are especially attentive to medical recommendations, information and suggestions from the teachers, and indicators of social problems. The staff is well trained and professionally competent. They hold appropriate professional degrees and have extensive experience. Study of their resumes indicates

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

there is a core staff that has worked together for many years on children's problems. The directors and supervisors of the ECE-HS programs spontaneously spoke to me of the professional and personal competence and wisdom of specific IPS staff members. Since such people are the "consumers" of the IPS services I felt they were in a good position to make such evaluations. Furthermore, my meetings with the parents of the children served reinforced these positive evaluations. Almost the only negative comments I heard in all my visits and meetings were that the DDST initial screening ought to be completed early in the year, there might be a greater willingness on the part of IPS to diagnose emotional (as opposed to Developmental) problems, and specific parents groups might be organized. The overwhelming evaluation was that IPS was very competently carrying out sorely needed services.

Some ECE-HS special staff (such as case workers and psychological counselors, commented upon the great skill with which IPS staff handled the coordination of complicated psychological, educational, and health problems. One staff member praised their management of parents and their abilities to explain the details and the 'why's" of school and health problems and procedures to parents. Another emphasized the benefits to HS teachers and aides of having help from such highly skilled professionals. She also commented upon the specificity of the instructional suggestions which were individually tailored for each child and his particular problems. I might mention that teachers of the Special Small Classes in both ECE and HS made much the same laudatory comments to me. They feel that they are getting sophisticated yet practical day-to-day help, especially from the IPS educational consultant.

Another set of comments from these and several other ECE-HS personnel were concerned with the in-service training aspects of IPS. Although these lie outside the realm of this report, they do bear upon the general effects of IPS. Both supervisors and teachers in ECE and HS remarked to me how profitable the in-service training from IPS had been and they specifically asked for more next year. The social work course and the remedial education course were specifically praised. I would recommend that an expansion of such in-service training be provided next year.

My observations of the Special Small Classrooms confirmed the reports in the preceding section. The teachers and aides were carrying out definite exercises patterned after the instructions suggestions. I observed lessons on gross and fine motor skills, orientation to body parts, language and speech skills, and development of personal and social skills and controls. Furthermore, the children were both enjoying and profiting from the instruction. In a few cases in which I had intensively studied the entire chart of the child before observing him, I could see that a child who had been virtually untestable or who had appeared to perform at a trainable retardate level at the beginning of the program was now performing at a noticeably higher level and would probably test out at an Educable or even low average level now. D. R., M. F., and L. A. are specific examples.

I would make one recommendation in regard to testing these youngsters psychometrically. Specialized instruments designed to take into account specific disabilities or deprivations should be used rather than the standard Stanford-Binet. While I know the State of Missouri and the Kansas City School District specifically require that test, it is not really appropriate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for such children. When marked speech and language delays and/or possible hearing impairments are involved, other tests such as the Merrill-Palmer, the Leiter International Performance Scale, and the Performance Section of the WPPSI, would give a measure of the child's intellect that would not be grossly penalized by his sensory or experiential deficits. I would recommend that a specialist in psychological testing of children with hearing or language impairments be invited to consult with the IPS staff in order to help them revise some of their assessment procedures. I would recommend either Dr. Neil Goetzinger or Dr. Mary Mira of the University of Kansas Medical Center. Both are recognized experts in the field.

Another recommendation would be to improve the record keeping especially in regard to test results and other data. IPS personnel are somewhat reluctant to place IQ, MA, and other data in the charts and other records. While I can appreciate their sensitiveness to this at present burning issue, surely such data could be kept in confidential charts. Its release to people outside of IPS could be determined by the IPS staff. Such data might prove invaluable in any objective, quantifiable evaluation of the value of their work should be attempted in the future.

Miscellaneous

Although the major areas required for this evaluation have been commented upon, several other apparently peripheral issues and problems came up in the course of my investigation that might bear mentioning.

Follow-up. As in all intervention programs the question soon arises as to what will happen when the children involved pass out of the jurisdiction of the specific program. IPS, ECE and HS personnel are already concerned

about this issue. While they expect many of the children with whom they have worked this year to be able to "make it" now in a regular school kindergarten (at least in the Urban Education Center or Follow-Through program) there are others who would not be able to do so. It is one measure of the professionalism of the IPS (and ECE and HS) staffs that they are actively working with the Kansas City School System and State Education Agency officials to see about initiating some new special education classes for handicapped children. Under present school laws and regulations it looks as if the only way this could be accomplished would be for these children to be labeled mentally retarded since the state would then provide part of the teachers' salaries. Fortunately, most of these children would fall into such a category if tested on the state's required psychometric instrument, i.e. the Stanford-Binet. Hopefully, these multiply handicapped children will be placed in such a special small class where they will continue to get the individualized programming and attention that they desparately need.

Need for instructional materials. Both IPS special educational personnel and teachers indicated that they could use to great advantage more curriculum materials. Evidently the IPS instructional suggestions to teachers are limited at times by the materials available rather than being dictated by the needs of the child. Since such materials are typically only a very small proportion of budgets, it would seem well worth while to invest funds in this area next year.

Multiplication of IPS workers' effect. Under the present policies and procedures IPS focuses most of its energies upon provision of services to individual children, or a single family, or to a specific teacher. While the aid they are rendering is sorely needed and their results are gratifying,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the scope of the problem to be faced is enormous. IPS could try to carry out some innovative group efforts in an attempt to spread their influence beyond the confines of a single case. I know that they do have a wider impact than upon one case at a time; yet I feel that two of the major requests by ECE-HS personnel could form a basis for multiplying the IPS efforts.

There were specific requests for more intensive and continuing in-service training efforts in the areas of social work and teaching. A single IPS worker such as the Director could offer an on-going course in social case work in which she could supervise and teach (and thus reach through her students) not only the case workers but also the many other families with whom they are working. Or alternatively, IPS social workers and psychological counselors could initiate a small group program for parents of children in the various ECE-HS programs. I understand there is a nucleus for such a program in that parent meetings are held in each school in the ECE-HS program. However, I was also told that only 5 to 10 parents come and that meetings are not held frequently enough for real group support and relationships to develop. I'm sure the psychologically sophisticated IPS staff could devise other and perhaps better methods.

Summary

The IPS staff has devised adequate, economical, and efficient procedures for identifying and referring ECE-HS children likely to have school adjustment problems related to physical, developmental, psychological, social and emotional problems and handicaps. Similarly, their system for making contacts, diagnosing children, prescribing remediation, and conducting, assisting and monitoring the special program of services to these children and their families is both adequate and professionally competent. Indeed, the staff seem very well trained in their specialties and possess considerable

experience. The previous experience of working together of several core members has probably been a strong contributing factor to the smoothness of the operation. Consumers of their services, i.e. ECE-HS supervisors and workers and the parents of the children, are loud in their praises of the benefits of having IPS in operation. I also feel from my study of IPS records, meetings with IPS, ECE, and HS personnel and with parents (as well as from direct observation of the children and their classes) that IPS is providing the integrating professional efforts needed to help such handicapped children, their generally overwhelmed families, and the valiant but often also overwhelmed schools and teachers. I would definitely recommend continuance of this fine project. Indeed, it could profitably be offered increased support.

Brief Listing of Recommendations

1. Early screening with the DDST be arranged preferably in the first two months of the school year.

2. A speech and language specialist be added to the IPS staff.

3. More referrals for audiological and speech/language evaluations be made for children with such problems.

4. Use of the Flash Card Vision Test with children who fail the "E" chart test.

5. Calculation and recording of the results of psychological, developmental, and educational testing in confidential files.

6. Revision of the criteria for categorizing children especially as it relates to the categories of hyperactive and mentally retarded.

7. Provision of pediatric and allied health professional consultants on a weekly or bi-monthly basis.

8. Expansion of the In-service training program, particularly the Case Work Supervision course and the Remedial Education Course.

9. Use of specialized psychological tests, designed to avoid gross penalty for hearing, speech, and language delays or impairments.

10. Provision of a specialist in psychological testing of children with hearing and language impairments for a brief consultancy with the goal of revising assessment procedures for such children.

11. Allowance and support for regular activities on the part of IPS staff to stimulate and develop follow-up services in the community for these children with handicaps after they leave the ECE-HS programs.

12. Increased funds for instructional materials to meet the specialized needs of these children.

13. Multiplication of the IPS staff's efforts through innovative ways of working with groups of professionals and parents.

14. Definite continuance of this fine project.

15. Increased funding to implement the preceding recommendations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Addendum to IPS Evaluation

Individual interviews were conducted with the three program administrators. In every case the response to IPS was favorable and enthusiastic. All three felt that IPS was providing needed and valuable services both to their staff and to the children and parents. They focused on much the same areas as previous ECE staff had done in their praise and suggestions for improvements. Once again the desirability of early screening with the DDST was spontaneously mentioned. Also, two of the three spontaneously mentioned the desirability of having a speech and language specialist in the IPS operation. The IPS administrative staff were again singled out for especial praise but the whole IPS staff was warmly commended for their knowledge and personal competence.

Two of the ECE administrators did feel that parent participation was most important and indicated they would welcome greater involvement of the IPS staff in conducting small group programs with parents. The overall organization of this aspect of the ECE-HS program has been carried out in the past by a worker not directly in the program, but that has been corrected for next year and IPS should have an opportunity in this area then.

Different administrators especially commended different aspects of the IPS program. One felt the educational recommendations and demonstrations in the classrooms to teachers of particular problem children were most beneficial. She thought this form of help to a child was also the most profitable form of in-service teacher education she had seen. She wanted to see more of it next year in the regular classrooms and hoped IPS would be able to expand that part of their program. The two others also had high praise for this aspect of IPS. One particularly commented upon the pleasant, non-threatening way the IPS staff was able to help a new teacher or

aide as well as deal with administrative personnel. She also stated the IPS staff really gave the HS educators the kind of social and psychological services they had wanted for years in the schools but could never get. The other stated that she didn't know what ECE-HS would be able to do for many of their handicapped children if IPS were not available.

All three ECE administrators wanted IPS to expand those services that incorporated in-service training as part of the IPS way of helping problem children. The constant availability of IPS personnel, their willingness to take on any problem, their "bird-dogging" of a particular aspect of a case and their persistence in counseling parents without any negative, judgmental attitudes were specific attributes of IPS staff which were mentioned.

In short, a very positive report of the value and capabilities of the IPS program was given by these three program administrators. They definitely wish to have the IPS services available to their programs next year and they also wish for some expansions of such services.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE